The Magic Jewel of Intuition

(The Tri Basic Method of Cognizing the Self)

By D.B. Gangolli

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Holenarsipura

The Magic Jewel of Intuition

The Tri-Basic Method of Cognizing The Self

This is a free translation of Kannada book "Paramartha Chinthamani" written by Sri Sri Sachidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya.

By : D.B. Gangolli

Published by:

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA

Holenarsipur – 573211

Ph : 08175-273820

http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

1986

Rarest Archiver

THE MAGIC JEWEL OF INTUITION:

Written by Sri D.B.Gangolli

Published by:

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA

Holenarsipur – 573211

Ph : 08175-273820

http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

I Edition : 1986

Pages : 18 + 476 + 84 = 578

Copyrights : © Reserved by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Rarest Archiver

FOREWORD

By Vidyaalankaara Prof. S. K. RAMACHANDRA RAO

(Prof. S. K. Ramachandra Rao was formerly of the National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro-sciences, and Bangalore University. Presently he is the Editor, Encyclopaedia of Indian Medicine Project. Besides, he has authored innumerable books on a wide range of subjects, including the various schools of philosophy, occult sciences like Sri Chakra Vidya etc., Ayurveda, Aesthetics, and is regularly participating in big seminars and conferences.)

My friend, Shri D. B. Gangolli, is a keen student of Vedanta. He is not content with pondering over the philosophical problems raised in Vedanta; he attempts to *live* Vedanta. He does not confine his attention to what reason can ascertain, but seeks to reinforce reason with Intuition. His analytical skill is tempered with a synthetic approach. While being thoroughly conversant with scientific discoveries and formulations relevant to philosophical discussions, he is also an artiste (being a musician) who has an eye for harmony, form and centrality. It is therefore that the present book, which he has written, is at once interesting, informative, wholesome and rewarding. It reads like a philosophical treatise, a scientific exposition and a literary testament, rolled into one.

The advent of Shri Satchidanandendra Swamy (of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur) marked a revolution in Vedantic discussions. He focussed attention on the original thought-structure of Shankara as distinct from later elaborations and manipulations,

Rarest Archive

and dedicated his entire, long life with a missionary zeal to expound the essential teachings of Advaita Vedanta as formulated by Shankara. He wrote extensively in Sanskrit, Kannada and English in order to vindicate his viewpoint that Shankara has been misrepresented by later commentators and glossators like the authors of *Bhaamati* and *Panchapaadika*. One of the works from his pen was *Paramaartha - Chintaamani* in Kannada, a profound dissertation employing the Intuitive-analytic methodology.

The present book by Shri Gangolli is a free rendering of this Kannada work, containing the contents but providing fresh dimension to the original discussion. "The Magic Jewel of Intuition" is a follow-up study of "*Paramaartha - Chintaamani*". Shri Gangolli has been in deep sympathy with the author of *Paramaartha - Chintaamani*, but has greatly augmented the technique employed in that book. He has discussed relevant conclusions reached by European philosophers and modern scientists. An important aspect of the present publication is the elaborate and interesting section entitled "Science and Spirituality", given as the appendix. He has pointed out how the discoveries of astrophysicists and modern biologists have projected new cosmological speculations and have modified evolutionary theories, and how this would support amply the Vedantic position with regard to the world around us and man's status in it. He has also underlined the significance of the present - day work in the field of consciousness, done by psychologists, physiologists and neurologists. Interesting is his discussion on the relationship between brain and mind. The Intuitive - analytic

Rarest Archive

method that the author has employed to evaluate the work done in the areas of astrophysics, nuclear physics and biology is a significant one, inasmuch as it is a corrective to the pure dialectical method. While reason has its role to play, an Intuitive and experiential reinforcement would benefit the seeker after Truth. Vedanta, specially the formulation of Shankara, rightly insists on "*Anubhavaanga – Tarka*" in contradistinction to "*Shushka - Tarka*". The author has attempted to demonstrate that Vedanta. can be looked upon as the "Science of Sciences", as the Science *par excellence* of Reality.

The book provides answers to an earnest seeker who wants to understand the nature of knowledge, Being, bliss, the three states, the contribution of nescience, the significance of the method of "*Adhyaaropa-Apavaada*" and the true standpoint of Shankara. While firmly rooted in the Vedantic tradition, the presentation here attempts to take the modern, intelligent student along the inquiry as he is accustomed to The book reads more like an independent inquiry than like a text-book of Vedanta, which in reality it is.

Shri Gangolli deserves the gratitude of all those who are interested in understanding Shankara's Vedanta aright, steering clear of later misrepresentations. The language here has throughout been engaging, the style impeccable, and discussions lofty. The book is a model of philosophical writing, at once precise and clear and comprehensive. The discerning reader will recognize that the author carefully avoids needless pedantry and irrelevant rambling.

Rarest Archives

I am happy that the work started by Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swami to focus the attention of the students of Vedanta on the essentials is being continued by Shri Gangolli. It is my earnest prayer that he will be allowed by Providence to complete the mission undertaken by the late Swami.

Bangalore
Date : 12-3-1986 S. K. RAMACHANDRA RAO

Rarest Archive

PREFACE

Vedanta is a spiritual science based on common life and universal experience. In these challenging times of nuclear science and an insatiable "scientific temper" among the intelligentsia, the highly 'scientific' or rational methodology that the Vedantic philosophy adopts in propounding and delineating the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman* is sure to exercise an enduring fascination on all thoughtful but dispassionate minds. Modern students of Vedanta, many of whom are befuddled by translations or adaptations of Sanskrit works which are dressed up in sombre dialectics replete with illustrations or analogies which have little or no bearing on and relevance to modern life, will find it a challenging task and trial in reckoning the fool-proof approach of this spiritual science. The critical and comparative discussions about the opinions of modern physical scientists and Western thinkers pertaining to phenomena like creation, the three states of consciousness, the psychic processes, epistemology, eschatology etc. at various places in this book, particularly in the Appendix, are sure to render the study of Vedanta more inspiring and to create an abiding interest in pursuing the Vedantic principles and teachings in one's life.

Although no particular scripture or Sanskrit treatise has been singly or exclusively followed as the basis for propounding the Vedantic truths in this book, Shri Shankaraachaarya's original *Bhashyas* or commentaries have been totally relied upon, and in the light of those extant commentaries of that great "World Teacher" the 'scientific' and traditional methodology that was implicit in the *Upanishadic* lore has been eminently brought out in expounding the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*. It would be profitable to remind

Rarest Archive

ourselves how the highly rational approach of Vedanta brought out of the *Upanishads* by the traditional teachers of Advaita Vedanta, viz. Shri Gaudapaada, Shri Shankara and Shri Sureshwara, differs from all other systems both in the comprehensiveness of its subject-matter and in the exclusive rational method it employs. Shri Shankara opines that the subject-matter of Vedanta is *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality, which as the Witnessing Self of all of us can be immediately and Intuitively experienced here and now. This Universal Self is not only distinct from the objective world, but also from the ego or the 'I' notion in all of us, and consequently from the body, the senses and the mind which are 'owned' by the ego. Therefore, it is beyond the scope of the dogmas of theology which rest on faith alone, as also beyond the surmises of speculative philosophy inasmuch as it is the most indubitable fact of human experience which can be neither affirmed nor denied; neither proved nor disproved by reason or dialectics and neither to be believed nor rejected as an impossible fact. As an *Upanishadic* text declares: The Ultimate Reality is "the direct, most immediately or intimately Intuited *Brahman*, our innermost Self." — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 3 - 5 - 1). The conviction about our own reality is based on Intuition and even if the whole world disputes it, that staunch conviction will not be affected in the least. But when the reality of anything other than our self has to be determined, we insist on unimpeachable and unquestionable evidence.

Its subject-matter being quite unlike that of any speculative philosophy, Vedanta does not set before itself the problem of explaining the universe by means

Rarest Archive

of logical deduction, or the task of widening the area of human knowledge by trying to harmonize the naturul sciences as far as possible. Attempt to solve such problems is of course quite in keeping with the viewpoint of systems which restrict their idea of the universe either to its subjective or objective portion. Vedanta, however, is not satisfied with partial views at all. Its view, therefore, is based on Intuition and conscious experience, leaving out no feature or aspect of life in its widest sense and reaches. And what is more, Vedanta claims to have 'discovered' the essence (*Atman*) of the universe in its entirety and assures us that — "Its realization is possible here and now for everyone that has the desire and capacity or qualifications for it." It follows from this that its method must be suitable for the purpose of 'exposing' or 'laying bare' the apparent unreality which the common-sense view is apt to take for Reality Itself. This method of "Superimposition and Rescission" has been briefly formulated and indicated in a half verse of ancient teachers of the Advaita Vedanta tradition and is quoted by Shri Shankara in these words : "And so runs the saying of those versed in the traditional method—'That which is devoid of all distinctive features is explained through deliberate superimposition and rescission" — (*Geetha Bhashya* 12-13) The method itself consists in leading the seeker to the Ultimate Reality or *Atman* through a concessional or apparent view taken up for the time being for the sole purpose of weaning his extrovert mind from a habitual error and subsequently abrogating the earlier assumed view also. It is illustrated in Shri Shankara's *Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya* by the pedagogical instances of employing

Rarest Archives

written symbols in order to instil the ideas of articulate sounds and abstract numbers into the pupil's mind.

Here in this treatise 'the tri-basic method' or the method of the three states of consciousness is the principal device or strategy which is used with utmost ingenuity and wisdom by our forbears to pin-point the aspirant's attention in arriving at the Ultimate Reality. This is very eminently contrasted with the natural but erroneous mono-basic method of all human beings without exception adopted in all their empirical dealings and deliberations, taking the waking state alone as the basis of their speculations. Of the several special varieties of propounding the Absolute Reality employed in the *Upanishads*, the so-called "*Avasthaatraya Prakriya*" or "the Method of the Three States of Consciousness" is the most convincing and easily understood, for it assumes nothing that is not already familiar or that is not in the experience of everyone in life. In fact, this method is a sure clincher as it takes the enquirer straight to the Intuition of the Witnessing Consciousness or Pure Consciousness at the back of, or as the substrate for, the ego, if only the seeker is prepared to give up his usual or natural predilection for the waking state viewpoint and has acquired the capacity to introvert and analyse Intuitively the nature of his experiences as he passes through the three modes of consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep. This is the device utilized in the *Maandukya Upanishad*, the smallest among the ten principal *Upanishads*, and turned to account by Shri Gaudapaada for explainig the most fundamental doctrines of Vedanta in his famous *Kaarikas* on that *Upanishad*. This book will be a 'companion volume' to

Rarest Archives

Shri K. A. Krishnaswamy Iyer's monumental work — "Vedanta or the Science of Reality", published by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur, Hassan District, Karnataka State. A unique feature of this book is the exquisite and exhaustive exposition of the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or the Self in its three aspects as Pure Existance (*Sadroopa*), Pure Knowledge of Consciousness (*Chidroopa*) and Pure Happiness or Bliss (*Anandaroopa*), devoting one chapter to each aspect so as to bring out in full details all the salient features and subtle truths implicit in the *Maandukya Kaarikas* of Shri Gaudapaada and the extant *Bhashyas* on them by Shri Shankara. Many *prima facie* objections that are, or can be, raised by scientists or rationalists, thinkers and philosophers are taken up for elaborate consideration and are solved convincingly with the help of the comprehensive or plenary viewpoint of Intuition or the Witnessing Pure Consciousness based on the tri-basic method. As the subject-matter is very subtle and difficult to comprehend, in order to do away with ambiguity certain words, phrases or expressions are monotonously or repeatedly used. Especially in the exposition of Vedantic teachings repetition is more a virtue than a vice. For the benefit of readers who are equally interested in the modern scientific developments vis-a-vis ancient Vedantic teachings or truths, an Appendix in which a brief comparative study of "Science and Spirituality" is added at the end of this book which will facilitate in its study.

This book is a free translation of the Kannada book — *"Paramaartha Chintaamani"* — by Shri Shri Satchidaanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, of revered memory, who was the founder of tha Adhyatma

Rarest Archive

Prakasha Karyalaya early in this century, and perhaps for the first time a relentless and sincere attempt has been made to demonstrate how this unique tri-basic method is prolific of beneficial results in its application to the discussion of most of the problems of modern philosophy and has the potentiality of 'revolutionizing' the approach of many thinkers and philosophers in arriving at the Absolute or Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman* of the *Upanishads*. Vedanta as a positive science founded on reason, Intuition and universal experience steers clear of all difficulties incidental to partial views whether of physical sciences, which have committed themselves to an objective, extrovert view of mind as well as matter, or of Realistic philosophies which aim at a critical view of the universe and try to generalize and harmonize the conclusions of the special sciences, or again of Idealistic systems which speculate on the basis of the laws of the intellect. All system-builders, whether of the East or of the West, have confined their attention to and have invariably given predominance to the waking state to the exclusion of the dream and the deep sleep states, and to that extent their systems have been necessarily defective. Furthermore, while the Highest or Ultimate Reality is universally Intuited in our sleep to be identical with our deepest and most innate Self, *Atman*, the Witnessing Pure Consciousness, these systems have been treating It as though It were an external object and are ingeniously trying to identify It either with some logical category such as substance (*Dravya*), quality (*Guna*), action (*Kriya*), universality (*Saamaanya*) or relation (*Sambandha*) or with some faculty of the waking mind such as idea, will or feeling. It is evident that no amount of generalization or criticism can ever land them at the genuine Reality. As

Rarest Archives

Shri Krishnaswamy Iyer says — 'These thinkers have traversed the whole gamut of human thought and have failed to arrive at finality. .. No wonder that the philosophic area of the present day appears to be an arena of unending conflicts. The absence of a tri - basic comprehensive view of life in its entirety has rendered each thinker's conclusions mere opinions, theoretical thought positions which failed to produce general conviction and which made it necessary as well as possible for every successive thinker to strike out a new path for himself, which terminated again in another wilderness."

The benefits that accrue from adopting the comprehensive and plenary viewpoint of this tri-basic method of Vedanta are: It overcomes scepticism; it rises above the charge of solipsism; it can solve the problem of 'Appearance' and 'Reality' conclusively and convincingly ; it provides a sure basis of ethics and a definite system of eschatology; it accounts for the apparent difficulty felt in the problem of perception; it reconciles the conflict of Idealism and Realism, and it supports and justifies the essential dogmas of theology by offering satisfactory proofs or consistent theories and explains the principles of aesthetics by a reference to Reality in Its aspect as Pure Bliss. If this book enables the genuine aspirants and students of Vedanta to reckon and acquire even a few of these benefits and helps them to adopt these unique Vedantic teachings in their daily life, the purpose for which it is published would be fulfilled. As I had to look after, all by myself, the various aspects in getting this book printed, like translation, typing the manuscript, proof-reading etc., there is a

Rarest Archiver

likelihood of many errors creeping in inadvertently for which lacuna I appeal to the readers to be generous and to bear with me.

I have to express here my deep gratitude and adoration to my spiritual guide, Shri Shri Satchidaanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, whose 170 and odd books in Kannada, Sanskrit and English on all Vedantic topics have served as a beacon light and have inspired me to propagate his unique methods of teaching and presentation of the subtle Vedantic truths in the pristine pure traditional system, ever since I came under his influence in 1970. As a mark of my reverence I dedicate this book to his memory and hereby make over all the publishing rights of this book to Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur, Hassan District, Karnataka State. I am beholden to the members of the Subharam Trust, 23, Prashant Nilayam, Serpentine Road, Kumara Park West, Bangalore – 560 020, viz. Dr. Smt. Subhashini Ramamurthy, Shri S. Ramamurthy, Shri Muniraja Setty and Shri S. M. Swamy, for their munificent donation towards the entire printing costs of this book. I also express my deep sense of gratitude to Prof. S. K. Ramachandra Rao, an eminent and erudite scholar and philosopher of Bangalore, for having readily agreed to write his kind Foreword at short notice. I will be failing in my duty if I do not express my indebtedness to Swami Bhagavatpaadaji, a direct disciple of Shri Shri Satchidaanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, who prompted and blessed me to write this translation, and the authorities of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur, the publishers of this book, particularly its dynamic and enterprising secretary,

Rarest Archive

Adhyatma Vidya Pravina Shri H. S. Lakshminarasimha Murthy, for their fullest cooperation and patronage. Last, but not the least, I am thankful to the printers of this book, The Chitra Printers, Link Road, Bangalore, for their unstinted cooperation to me throughout and to all my friends and well-wishers who have given me moral support and encouragement in bringing out this book published without any profit-making motive.

D. B. GANGOLLI

B I-5, Dattaprasad Co-op. Housing Society
10th Main Road, Malleswaram
BANGALORE-560 003.
March 23,1986.

Rarest Archive

CONTENTS

FOREWORD ... ... Page (i)

PREFACE — — — — — Page (vi)

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION

A) The Uniqueness of Vedanta Philosophy....Pages 1 to 21

B) The Greatness of Vedantic Knowledge........ 21 to 30

C) Who are Those Qualified or Fit for the Vedantic Discrimination—— 31 to 35

CHAPTER II : DISCRIMINATION ABOUT THE ULTIMATE REALITY

A) The Viewpoint of the Three States of Consciousness—— 35 to 42

B) The Need for Discrimination on All the Three States of Consciousness —— 42 to 50

C) The Special Features of the Discriminative Method of the Three States of Consciousness..... 50 to 63

D) The Objections and Satisfactory Answers regarding the Method of the Three States..... 63 to 87

E) An Outline of the Method of the Three States — 88 to 106

F) The Important Verdicts that Become Evident from the Discrimination about the Three States—— 106 to 113

Rarest Archives

CHAPTER III : THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF EXISTENCE

A) Atman or the Self Himself is the Real Existence...... 114 to 123
B) The Three Stages or Levels of Existence...... 124 to 140
C) Pure or Absolute Existence .... 141 to 153
D) The Varieties of or Different Forms of Existence........... 154 to 162
E) The Divisions of Reality and Unreality— 162 to 182
F) The Existence of the Waking and the Dream is One Alone........ 182 to 217
G) The Nature of Pure Existence ——— 217 to 231

CHAPTER IV : THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE OR CONSCIOUSNESS

A) Atman or the Self Alone is the Real Knowledge or Consciousness——— 231 to 260
B) The Three Levels of Knowledge or Consciousness - —— 260 to 277
C) Pure or Absolute Consciousness or Knowledge——— 277 to 294
D) The Different Forms of Knowledge or Consciousness—— 294 to 298
E) The Divisions of Correct Knowledge And Wrong Knowledge——— 298 to 304
F) The Consciousness of Waking and Dream is One and the Same........ 305 to 345
G) The Essential Nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness........ 345 to 384

Rarest Archive

CHAPTER V : THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF HAPPINESS

A) Atman Alone is Pure Happiness — 384 to 399

B) Differences in Happiness — 400 to 406

C) Pure or Absolute Happiness or Bliss — 406 to 412

D) The Different Forms of Happiness or Bliss — 413 to 415

E) The Divisions of Happiness and Grief — 415 to 423

F) The Essential Nature of Pure Bliss — 423 to 432

CHAPTER VI : CONCLUSION

A) The Gist of What has been Stated so far — 432 to 453

B) Benefits of the Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality — 453 to 465

C) Conclusive Remarks — 465 to 476

APPENDIX— A BRIEF COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SCIENCE and SPIRITUALITY 83 Pages.

Rarest Archiver

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

His Holiness Shri Satchidaanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, of revered memory, had written more than 15 books on Vedanta in English, besides editing the book, "Vedanta or The Science of Reality", by the late Shri K. A Krishnaswamy Iyer. Swamiji has also written masterly introduction in English to his own two magnificent Sanskrit works, viz. Maandukya Rahasya Vivrutihi and Vedanta Prakriyaa Pratyabhijna. His presentation of Vedanta in a precise, classical style has earned the admiration of several Indian scholars as well as critics from the West. Etre, a quarterly French philosophical journal, published from Paris, has serialized a couple of translations of Swamiji's works.

Swamiji had confined himself mostly to writing in Kannada to help the common earnest seekers of Karnataka, having been a Kannadiga. For more than 50 years he had edited continuously the monthly Kannada magazine, "Adhyatma Prakasha", and for some time had devoted four pages for articles on Vedantic topics in English. It was his desire to present pristine pure Vedanta as propounded by Shankara in his original, extant Bhashyas to the modern thinkers and earnest students in English, and with this intention he had written several thought-provoking English books.

We cherish that his desire should be fulfilled by publishing more and more useful books in English. Shri D. B. Gangolli had previously written a translation of one of Swamiji's Kannada works, entitled "The Unique Teaching of Shankara" (A Discussion on his Adhyaasa Bhaashya). This book now being published is in continuation of that effort. We hope that the discerning readers will appreciate our attempt to present Swamiji's enlightening thoughts and teachings to the English-knowing aspirants.

THANDAVESWAR ARKALGUD
Chairman
Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya,
Holenarasipur.

18-3-1986

Rarest Archive

Rarest Archives

THE MAGIC JEWEL OF INTUITION

I INTRODUCTION

(A) The Uniqueness of Vedanta Philosophy

1. What is meant by Vedanta ?

Man is yearning to know the reality of his own being as well as of the world around him from time immemorial. 'Is there one and only one reality which is the essence of this whole universe, or is it to be believed that this diverse universe is real as it appears ? What is the reality of the existence or being of all this ? What is the reality of my consciousness and of the consciousness appearing in sentient creatures like me ? What is the relation between the being of the whole universe and the consciousness which illumines it ? When I perceive the world, once I get pleasure and once I get grief. What is the substrate of these pleasures and griefs ? I and other creatures like me live here and aspire to acquire happiness and to prevent grief by adjusting our environmental conditions. What is the secret of this aspiration ?"— In all such ways man is thinking within himself, is communicating to another what is known or understood by him, is listening to what others say in this regard ; and in this manner, what is said, heard discussed and decided by many people he is systematizing those decisions and writing them down. Thus this mass of knowledge collected alone is the philosophical (spiritual) science or the science of the Ultimate Reality. The philosophical science is a science which undertakes, discovers and then propounds or teaches the Ultimate Reality or Essence, i.e. that basic stuff which has to be recovered after removing the extraneous, loose dross of the entire universe.

Rarest Archive

2. There is no certainty among the philosophers as to what the subject-matter of philosophical science is :

There is no unanimity yet among people about the question—What is the uncommon (special) subject-matter of philosophical science ? In our country, i.e. India, all those who have believed to have found out the Ultimate Reality have called that which they enunciate as their tenets or teachings as *'Darshana'*. The literary meaning of the word *'Darshana'* is : 'The science which teaches what is seen or perceived in experience' only ; but it is to be said that none of these schools of philosophical science has taught its tenets keeping that thing which is in everyone's experience as their subject-matter. For, philosophers of every school have taken their own opinion of the universe got on analysing it from their own respective viewpoint, and have propagated that alone as their teaching of the Ultimate Reality, but neither any of the other schools of philosophy nor the rest of the common run of people have unanimously accepted any one philosophical teaching in the manner-"This is the final vardict". For that reason alone there was room for raising such a question as : "If Kapila is omniscient, what criterion is there to prove that Kanaada is not ? If both are omniscient, how could there arise a difference in their respective opinions ?". Just because *Meemaamsakas*, who put this question, started off with the main proposition that Vedas are of non-human origin, their teaching also did not become final ; philosophers belonging to schools like *Naivyauylka*, *Jaina* and *Bauddha* etc. immediately contradicted it. Even todav, there are many opponents to their contentions. Anyhow, the word *Darshana'* or 'the science of teaching what is in one's experience', instead of becoming a philosophical treatise which states what is experienced, has remained to mean that it is a

Rarest Archiver

philosophy taught in keeping with their respective view-point.

It is the same state of affairs among the Western philosophers too. Because they have incessantly used the word philosophy' to mean any one opinion found about the subject-matter of the entire mass of objects, what is decided as the Ultimate Reality according to their respective viewpoint and consequently reconciled with dialectics alone has become for them the science of philosophy. • Because there is no restriction or regulation whatsoever that in dialectics there should be a finality reached at a particular stage or point, in their countries too it has become very easy for people to formulate their own 'philosophy' by forwarding or propounding, from a different viewpoint, a stronger system of dialectics. Therefore, from very ancient times to this day various schools of philosophy have continued to be born in these countries. Among them some have made efforts to be in consonance with the religious texts; some others have attempted to establish themselves on the strength of their own independent dialectics. Anyway, because of the acceptance of the fact that everything is to be established on dialectics alone' is a common feature among all of them, at present many of those philosophies have disappeared and have remained in the memories of historians only who study them out of curiosity. The literary meaning of the word 'philosophy' is 'the love of knowledge'; but it would not be wrong if it is said that among the Western philosophies the love of dialectics has become greater than the love of knowledge. Let it be. Of late, the Westerners have realized that for dialectics **the support of experience is necessary** They are declaring that any philosophical science

Rarest Archive

which does not take any subject-matter that is determined by physical science through the means of examination, experimentation and synthesis as the basis is not worth its name. They are saying that it is the duty of the philosophical science to examine completely the universe that is in front of us as well as the present-day social life, and that to keep on discussing matters imagined with the help of the human intellect alone can never be called a philosophical science. Not only this; a couple of those people have mentally realized that it is quite essential for the philosophical science to analyse completely the objective realm. In spite of all this, it is not possible to say for anyone that among the Westerners also there is unanimity regarding the question —What is the special subject-matter of the philosophical science ? It appears that some among them have fallen a prey to the delusion that the totality of all the empirical or physical sciences is itself the philosophical science. What they say is : We do not know yet many parts (aspects) of the world ; it is not possible to say also that we have completely analysed all the known parts or aspects and have thereby come to a final conclusion about them. Besides, is it possible at all to grasp completely the Ultimate Reality and then explain it by means of the various perceptual details which are conceived or constructed by the limited human mind or intellect ? How can the mind which is itself one part of the Ultimate Reality be able to determine the whole of the Ultimate Reality Itself ? There is a belief that man gets not only the perceptual knowledge of objects through the senses but also certain experiences through meditation, Yogic practices etc. Only after all those are taken into consideration it will be possible to determine the Ultimate Reality. For all these reasons, to say that 'the philosophical science regarding the Ultimate Reality ends here' is an idiotic statement. **The philosophi-**

Rarest Archive

cal science of the Ultimate Reality is one which denotes the determination of the Ultimate Reality which we have arrived at in consonance with dialectics for the time being ; in this sense, the philosophical science regarding the Ultimate Reality means the totality of the physical sciences and hence, like the empirical sciences, that (Reality) will keep on changing and will have to be established according to the times—this is their opinion. It is the opinion of some Westerners that, just as it is acknowledged by the physical sciences that the common thought constructs of time, space and causation etc. are self-established, it is the business of the philosophical science to find out the truth of those categories only ; in addition to this, some others opine that it must include the truth of religious and moral feelings and then determine the whole Reality and this alone is its duty. Anyway, it can only be said that just as in our country (i.e.India) in the Western countries too the question as to what the subject-matter of the philosophical science is is yet un-established in a similar manner.

3. There is no well-established method or system of reasoning among the philosophers :

Just as there are differences of opinion regarding the subject - matter of the philosophical science, there have arisen differences of opinion regarding the method or system of reasoning to be adopted in determining the subject-matter of the philosophical science at all times and in all countries. In the olden times among the Westerners those who said that 'to determine the Ultimate Reality it should be argued out on the strength of the respective religious texts alone' were very powerful ; even today some people of that opinion can be found. But in our country, just as there

Rarest Archive

arose a controversy with regard to the question of the omniscience of our philosophers, many present-day philosophers, who found that there continues to be discussion with regard to the question as to which among the many religious texts is fit to occupy the highest position, have decided that for the philosophical science, like the physical sciences, experience alone should be of prime importance, as also that dialectics which stands on the support of experience alone should be the main means or instrument. It is proper, indeed. Because for dialectics and experience there are no restrictions of nationality, times, caste, creed, race etc. and because when considering the validity of (scriptural) statements etc. these two alone (i.e. dialectics and experience) are to be followed, these two alone are the suitable means. But just as in our country so also among the Westerners, even those who have undertaken to use only reasoning and expereience, although they have been profusely using these while condemning the tenets of other schools of philosophy, they have been squeezing in aspects which are agreeable to themselves, in the name of religion, into their own philosophy (In this regard more details can be known from the book, "The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy" by Dr. S. Radhàkrishnan). For this reason, just as in our country so also in the Western countries, among the thinkers there is no scope for unanimity with regard to the Ultimate Reality. In addition to this, the Westerners do not seem to have made till now the proper analytical study regarding questions like —What is this phenomenon called 'experience'? What are these things called 'reasons'? If one reason is opposed to another, which of them is to be followed and why? If one experience appears to be opposed to another then what? Therefore, in their method or system of reasoning also there has arisen an important problem.

Rarest Archive

4. Vedantins have accepted only reasoning and experience :

The purpose of our having started now a text pertaining to the philosophical science of the Ultimate Reality is : As it is possible to determine the Ultimate Reality on the strength of reasoning and experience alone, there is a school of philosophy which has exclusively undertaken this task and has fearlessly propagated the Reality. As a result of ratiocinating on the teachings of that school of philosophy, not only can ambiguities [or anomalies] in the present-day system of philosophical study be removed but also the hope that the complete purpose or goal of the philosophical science of the Ultimate Reality can be attained is created in us. Therefore, we are making an attempt to acquaint the readers with that philosophical science. The present philosophical science which we are explaining becomes explicit on the strength of the methodology indicated in the *Upanishads*; because the *Upanishads* have another name of *'Vedantas'*, this school of philosophical science has acquired the name of *'Vedanta Darshana'*. For this reason only the followers of this school of philosophy are called *'Vedantins'*. Though it is true that this school of philosophy was born from the teachings of the scriptural (*Upanishadic*) texts, the Ultimate Reality enunciated by them is not to be realized taking either the scriptures or the statements of any preceptor as the valid means or evidences [*Naishkarmya Siddhi* 4-19]. In this school of philosophy both experience (universal and not individual) and reasoning have been given prominence in an extra-ordinary manner. The method of solving the problem of contradiction, which is apparently seen among the experiences as well as the essential nature of genuine reasoning which stands out as extremely powerful, has been determined in a manner acceptable to all., In this book, because we have explained in a lucid language the

Rarest Archives

supreme '**Intuitive experience**' as well as the **supreme 'Intuitive reasoning**' envisaged by the philosophical science of Vedanta so as to be understood by even the common run of people, there is a great benefit from this text to all those who are enthusiastic about determining the Ultimate Reality by means of dialectics alone. Because we have, at various places, mentioned as to where the topics, which are predominantly logical or in keeping with Intuitive experience, are to be found in the Sanskrit texts and have also all along quoted the numbers of chapter, verse etc., even to those who have a predilection to depend upon the original Sanskrit texts this book will be of great help to know the real purport of the original texts. But as we have not exemplified any sentence as an authoritative quotation to be believed perforce for the mere reason that it is a sentence, the exact literary meaning of each sentence will not be found here ; the readers should keep it in mind that we have accepted only the reasoning to be found in the original text and have included it in our book.

5. Vadantins say that tbey follow a comprehensive viewpoint and carry on their discrimination :

The Ultimate Reality can be compared to *Chintaamani* (a magic jewel) of the celestial world. That (jewel) assumes (according to some mythological texts) whichever form one (i.e. the owner) imagines or wishes. Some say there is the Ultimate Reality and some say It is not there at all ; some say It is one and only one, while some say It is manifold; some opine that It is endowed with various qualities, while some say It is without any qualities; some say It is with action, while some say It is devoid of action; some say It is of the form of

Rarest Archives

knowledge, while some say It is of the form of meaning; some say It is of the form of cause, while some say It is devoid of both cause and effect; some are of the opinion that It is of the nature of happiness, while some are of the opinion that It is of the nature of grief or misery; some say It is in the form of 'I' notion, while some say It is of the form devoid of the notions of 'I' and 'you' [*Aitareya Bhashya* 2-1-1]—In all such ways the disputants are variously describing It. If an entity, which has given rise to so many types of imaginations or surmises and which in future also may give room for many other varied imaginations, is compared to the celestial jewel, i.e. *Chintaamani*, what is wrong ? Even so, all disputants agree that the Ultimate Reality should exist with one distinct form only. It being so, we have to imagine that in the methods of discrimination, adopted by the disputants with regard to the Ultimate Reality with utterly contrary descriptions, there must be some defect. The Vedantins say that this defect is to be found in the viewpoints of the respective disputant, and because none of these disputants has followed or adopted **a comprehensive viewpoint** these different opinions regarding the Ultimate Reality have arisen.

Among the Vedantins also there are different schools of the types of *Dvaita, Advaita, Dvaitaadvaita, Vishishthaadvaita, Shuddhaadvaita* etc. But **the rest of the Vedantins** (other than Advaitins following Adi Shankara), believing the *Upanishads* to be authoritative sources, are advocating that even contradictory interpretations should be believed on the authority of the *Upanishads*. Their opinion is that just as in the case of topics like *Karma* (action), *Jeeva* (soul), *Samsaara* (transmigratory life), *Srishti* (creation), *Janmaantara* (other births), *Lokaantara* (other worlds) etc., which

Rarest Archive

Vedantins refer to, there has to be unanimity (among them) with regard to the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality on the authority of the scriptural texts only. But as far as the **Advaita Vedantins who follow Adi Shankaraacharya** are concerned, they declare boldly : "The scriptural texts teach an entity as it is, but do not create afresh what does not exist", (*Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya* 2-1-20); "Even if a hundred scriptures say that fire is cold, it does not illumine (is not bright), they cannot be authoritative or valid." (*Gita Bhasya* 18-16). They have vociferously announced that : "Not only there is knowledge of the form of meditations (*Upaasasana*) taught in the *Upanishads*, but also there is knowledge of the Ultimate Reality as it is, taught in the *Upanishads*" (*Sutra Bhashya* 1-4-4). "Therefore with regard to this knowledge (of the Ultimate Reality) not only the (scriptural) sentences are authoritative or valid but **Intuitive experience** also is authoritative." (*Sutra Bhashya* 1-1-2). In accordance with this, they have taught both Intuitive reasoning and Intuitive experience and have formulated their doctrines. And because knowledge (of the Ultimate Reality) has to be attained in keeping with Intuitive reasoning and Intuitive experience, it is proper if it is said that only after the doctrines or teachings are formulated in consonance with this (knowledge) the meanings or interpretations of sentences pertaining to exclusively invisible or extra-sensory topics like *Karma, Samsaara* etc. can be made in full agreement with the Ultimate Reality. Therefore, now we propound only that knowledge of comprehensive viewpoint which the Advaita Vedantins (Even before Shankaraacharya there were many brands of Advaita Vedanta and even today there are several of them. But we have called Shankara's Advaita as taught in and through his Bhashyas or commentaries only—as 'Vedanta' here) teach. To all aspirants, whether they are followers of the rituali-

Rarest Archiver

stic tenets of the Vedas, or followers of other creeds or religions, or those who do not acknowledge any religious school or path but are independent thinkers, the conclusions of this portion are capable of being understood. In fact, a dispassionate reader will be convinced that only after the greatness of this portion is understood, it would be possible to expound and justify, in accordance with the teachings of this philosophical science of Vedanta, the basis and need for topics like morals, religion, society, politics, education etc.

6. The viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness of the Vedantins :

Vedantins say that they carry out discriminative thinking following a comprehensive viewpoint or outlook, while all the others are not able to cognize the Ultimate Reality because they carry out their deliberations adopting a defective non-comprehensive outlook, is it not? What they (Vedantins) refer as a comprehensive viewpoint is not at all a queer, uncommon viewpoint. It is of a kind which takes up dispassionately or impartially the entire gamut of experiences of all born creatures and examines or analyses them incisively or intrinsically. All of us invariably or without fail keep on experiencing the three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep. Not a single human being is to be found in any region whatsoever who does not have the experience of these three types. It is not possible at all for any one to have his way even if he obstinately decides in the manner—"I do not want deep sleep, do not want dream, enough if I have waking alone '; it becomes quite contrary to one's nature to give up deep sleep itself. Even so, for some reason or other people have more respect for or faith in the waking statae lone. Though this attitude is

Rarest Archive

enough or valid for their empirical transactions or dealings, no one can possibly say that waking alone is concerned to his life. Man's span of life can be measured by the series or line of waking, dream and deep sleep alone. Although our experience (Intuition) includes all these three states (of Consciousness), the philosophers (who inquire into the Ultimate Reality) are discriminatively considering only the waking; neither in our country nor in other countries, neither in the olden times nor in the present times do we find any school of philosophers other than Vedantins who have given equal value (or status) to the three states of Conciousness (viz. waking, dream and deep sleep) and have carried out their discriminative deliberations. Not that there are no thinkers at all who have used the names of dream and deep sleep; there are those who have considered that, because dream and deep sleep are needed for the waking, they are inferior states which are appendages to it (i.e. waking state) but not at all any (thinkers or philosophers) who, having considered that these three states are verily equal, have established their teachings (or their philosophy) and dialectics on a comprehensive and complete Intuitive experience (If it is clearly analysed, it can be discerned that the Vedantic methodology, which is common to all the Upanishads, is called the *Adhyaaropa Apavaada Nyaaya* or the method of the form of negating or rescinding all misconceptions superimposed on the all-witnessing *Atman* alone. This alone is the comprehensive viewpoint. The viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness is merely one important kind in it. For this topic refer to sub-section No. 168 as well as the introduction to that Chapter) which has examined all these three states. What the special feature of the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness is, we will explain in the next Chapter. In this Chapter, however, we will state first what

Rarest Archive

a profound philosophical teaching will follow from this easy analysis which is carried out in accordance with everyone's experience alone and what a great benefit is accruing to us from the knowledge of that philosophical teaching.

7. The essential nature of the Ultimate Reality taught in Vedanta :

In Vedanta the essential nature of this universe is called *Brahman*. It is being called our *Atman* also because *Brahman* is the essence of Being of the entire world as well as all of us who exist within it. Because that *Brahman* exists independently without being controlled by anything else whatsoever, as also everything else is controlled by it, *Brahman* is given the name *Ishwara* also. To indicate that It is self-effulgent and everything is illumined by Its effulgence only, It is called also as *Jyothi* (Light), *Deva* (Shining Entity) and *Devata* (Deity). Because It can never be destroyed, It is called *Akshara* (Indestructible) and because It is not perceptible to our senses It is called *Avyakta* (Unmanifested) also. Similarly, other names like *Praana* (the cause for everything to live), *Akaasha* (effulgent everywhere) are also there. It will have to be determined whether that nature which we have mentioned here—does it exist in the Ultimate Reality or not ? Only at the end of the deliberations mentioned in this text will it be possible to determine the answer to that question. But for the time being, we ask the readers to observe this much : They should keep in mind that, irrespective of whatever meanings being adduced to these words usually, without taking all of them into the reckoning it should be understood that these various names are given only to the Ultimate Reality in Vedanta.

Rarest Archive

If some of the statements in the *Upanishads* praising the Ultimate Reality are listened to with rapt attention, the essence of the teaching of Vedanta will be known to us "*Brahman* is real (Satyam), knowledge (*Jnaanam*), eternal (*Anantam*)"—(*Taittireeya Upanishad* 2-1), "*Brahaman* is Intuitive knowledge (*Vijnaana*), bliss (*Ananda*)" — (*Brihadaaranyaka* 3-9-28), "I am *Brahman*"— (*Brihadaaranyaka* 1-4-10), "That Thou Art"— (*Chhaandogya* 6-8-7), "This *Atman* is verily *Brahman*"-(*Brihadaaranyaka* 2-5-19, 4-4-5), "All this is *Brahman* alone"—(*Maandukya* 2, *Mundaka* 2-2-11)," Nothing whatever that is variegated here exists"—(*Katha* 2-1-11)— Such sentences are as many as one can desire in the *Upanishads* According to Vedantic philosophy, the entire universe seen in front of us is one and one Absolute Reality only, there are no categories of the forms of sentient and insentient things in It, all this is one and one Entity only which is Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness, Pure Bliss. If these statements are measured from the level of our common beliefs, they appear to be the ramblings of mad men. Because they are all contrary to percepts or perceptual knowledge, the rest of the Vedantins are also saying that these are not the interpretations of the *Upanishadic* statements. In spite of it, only the Advaita Vedantins are stating courageously that "what is stated here (in the *Upanishadic* statements mentioned above) is the Absolute Reality alone; this Reality can be cognized or realized by Intuitive experience; all this we can realize by an examination of the three states of Consciousness". Therefore, it is proper for all those who have a keen interest in the discriminative knowledge of the Ultimate Reality to examine their statements and then propagate their opinions among common people.

8. The Various fruits accruing from the knowledge of Brahman ;

Any person may ask the questions : What is the utility or benefit accruing if it is understood that the Absolute

Rarest Archive

Reality or *Brahman* is of the essential nature of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness, Pure Bliss, as stated in the *Upanishads*, as also that very Entity is the *Atman* of all of us? Vedantins' answer to this question is : By this (knowledge) grief and delusion will be driven away, doubts will be removed; the exhaustion or tiredness of people who are withering away by constant labour will be removed; the fear of people who are afraid of things in life will vanish into thin air; the misery of grief-stricken people will be driven away ; the poor will feel as if they have attained a fortune, the coward will feel as if they have been invigorated by courage, there will be success in all endeavours, and all desired things will be acquired. This is not at all an exaggeration. It is enough if we see the history of the *Maharshis* (grand sires or seers) who have compassionately taught the *Adhyaatma Vidya* or the Knowledge of the Inner Self to the world, we will immediately realize the truth of this (philosopical teaching). Those were great people of wisdom. Because kings and emperors were treating them with reverence, if they wanted wealth, power or mundane enjoyments it was not at all difficult for them to get their ambitions fulfilled. Even so, they had discarded city-life, had gone to forests and were spending their time in contemplation about the Ultimate Reality alone, observing constant celibacy (and other austerities). It is mentioned in our mythological texts that some among them were even fully satisfying the kings and their retinues, who were visiting their *Ashrams* or monasteries as guests, by providing all suitable things of enjoyment by creating them through their Yogic powers. To us who do not at all know the essential nature of those miraculous powers, all those look like imagined tales now. Let it be. Even though they were revered by the whole world and were endowed with all kinds of powers or means to get their desires fulfilled, if they had discarded

Rarest Archive

or shunned all those things with utmost sense of renunciation and had merged themselves in the contemplation of the Inner Self, what a great value they might have had given to the Knowledge of the Absolute Reality !

9. The Knowledge of Brahman (the Absolute Reality) will help avoid demoniac attitude and will mitigate grief or misery:

Those ancient holy men have propagated that the cause for all the miseries suffered by people is the lack of Self-knowledge alone, that all disasters or difficulties have arisen because of not having viewed everything from the standpoint of *Atman* or the Self but from the viewpoint of the body alone and, therefore, the desire for attaining Self-knowledge alone is supremely auspicious(*or blissful*). Those who have not known *Atman* or the Self and, as a result of the ignorance of the Self, who are immersed in the deliberations about the not-Self alone are the great degenerated souls who have committed suicides. As a result of this degeneration or degradation they are born as devils only. They cannot at all be considered as human beings: it makes no difference at all whether they live or die. Their plight is like that of those who have fallen into an unfathomably deep, forsaken well which is so covered with darkness that eye-sight cannot perceive in the least and are going down and down ! — Thus is described in the *Upanishads* (*Isa*–3) the fate of those who do not know *Atman* or the Self. Out of compassion that people should not degenerate into this kind of a damned or sorry state, the real nature of *Atman* as well as the essence of the world is taught in those sacred (scriptural) texts. Therefore, overcoming (the sin of) suicide or killing the Self, evading

Rarest Archive

demoniac attitude, ascending to the level of a true human being is the one great benefit or purpose of (attaining) Self-knowledge. Without knowing how best the various new inventions and appliances that the physical sciences have discovered can be utilized, people are always terrified with fear, thinking as to when and which among the dangers like famine, epidemic and war etc., which are the fruits of their own attachment and hatred, will descend upon them. If one of them visits them, without being able to find out as to who is responsible for this calamity they keep on putting the blame on one another and aggravate or whip up their attachments and hatreds By divine dispensation or decree when people as well as nations are destroyed they despair and yell out in the manner — "Oh God! Oh Father! Help us God! In such a desperate situation the physical sciences, without being able to show any way out, repeat the slogan of despondency or dis-illusionment in the manner : "I can know only this much, herefore let your intellect and wisdom be in your control!" At that time, if there is the protection or benevolence of the Absolute Reality people will not only give up demoniac attitude and attain the real manhood but also may ascend to divinehood from man-hood, hoisting aloft, as it were, the philosophical banners of charity, religious duties kindness, service of others etc. Is not this a great benefit ?

10. Our essential nature mentioned in Vedanta is devoid of Samsaara, the wheel of births and deaths :

The difference or disparity between our essential nature of Being as it is praised in the *Upanishads* and

Rarest Archive

our essential nature as we have understood it now is as much as that between the mountain *Meru* and a sesamum seed. What is our knowledge at present as regards ourselves? "In us there are many blemishes and shortcomings; hunger, thirst, old age and death—such things are shadowing us; disease and deficiencies do not seem to leave us. Our desires and plans are in thousands and among them desires which cannot be fulfilled are more. We are born in one particular place and at a particular time and we are so non-independent that at the end, one day or other, we become one with the sand"—such an opinion is deep-rooted in us, is it not? But look at the description of our innate, essential nature of Being mentioned in the *Shrutis* (*Upanishads*) : There is no defect whatsoever in *Atman* or the Self; there is no old age, no death, no misery, no delusion, no hunger, no thirst; there is no desire which remians unfulfilled by Him, *Atman*, no plan or proposal which He cannot achieve. He alone should be discovered or found out. He alone should be known (Intuitively). One who clearly knows and attains this *Atman*, for him all worlds and all desires will be in his control or grasp" (*Brihadaaranyaka* 3-5-1; *Chhaandogya* 8-7-1).

11 Though we suffer death from the empirical standpoint, we are deathless from the Absolute standpoint :

Here a doubt may arise in the minds of some people That is: If our essential nature of Being were as it is described in the *Upanishads*, then we could have had belief in this 'myth of castles in the air'. But how is the real state of affairs? Some idiots might have totally believed that we have no old age, no death; but whichsoever discrimi-

Rarest Archives

native thinker can say this statement to be true? Who does not know that all creatures are born, are growing and changing day by day, suffer from hunger and thirst, wither away from disease and deficiencies, become old and, like the old trees toppling over to the ground, drop down their bodies and disappear? Let it be anybody - the weak, the strong, the poor, the fortunate, the farmers, the kings, the materialists, the renunciates or recluses, the dull-heads, the wise, the theists, the atheists, the disciples, the preceptors, the ignorant, the knowledgeable — are there any of these who are not caught in the jaws of the Lord of Death? It is neither possible for any *Rishi* or sage, whosoever he may be, who has taught the world the manner of conquering Death or for any *Acharya*, or preceptor, whosoever he may be, who has explained or expounded those *Rishis'* opinions, to evade the onslaught of the 'Demolisher', nor has anyone ever subsisted having become immortal. It being so, what should we call one who boasts that our essential nature of Being does not experience old age, death! If in our philosophical texts there are only such grandma's stories to be found, there is no other reason needed at all to say that in the present times they are not wanted.

Though such a sort of doubt flashes naturally in the minds of everyone, solutions or satisfactory answers to such a doubt also do not remain unprovided in our philosophical texts. The fact that 'getting born, growing, withering away and dying are all natural to all creatures' is true, indeed, from one viewpoint. But viewed from the standpoint of Vedanta it will be clearly known that birth and death are merely empirical dealings and that these appearances of birth and death do not relate in the least to our true, innate nature of Being. Anybody may ask — "Are

Rarest Archive

births and deaths merely an appearance? Have we not perceived people really dying?" True. But this is asked from a standpoint without our having made any discriminative thinking. If it is viewed from the Vedantic standpoint, it can be realized without doubt that *Atman or the Self* of all of us is without any change whatsoever and exists eternally in His one and only one essential nature of Being. The viewpoint which the philosophical science of Vedanta depicts to us is called the *Paramaartha Drishti* or the Absolute or Transcendental viewpoint. The essence of this Absolute viewpoint as well as the manner in which we can cognize the real, essential nature of our *Atman* by means of that viewpoint will be stated in due course. For the time being, it is enough if we understand this much, viz : *Paramaartha Drishti* or the Absolute viewpoint is not one of those queer viewpoints which is attained rarely by any one person as a result of a certain holyman's grace. There is no need whatsoever 'to believe sincerely' that this kind of a viewpoint exists; there is no need either to discard the universal or everybody's common experiences. When we do not carry out any discriminative thinking, we consider from the natural veiwpoint and determine the essential nature of objects to be correct in such and such a manner alone, is it not ? This natural or commonplace viewpoint is called *Vyaavahaaric Drishti* (empirical viewpoint) or *Laukika Drishti* (commonman's viewpoint). There is no restriction at all that what is perceived through the empirical viewpoint has to be perforce in that same way. People had in the past known that water was only one entity ; but these days from the examination or analysis made by the chemists it has been found out that in that (water) two gases, viz oxygen and hydrogen, have combined. It has become well-known that all the

Rarest Archives

discoveries of the physical sciences have kept on amending or changing every now and then the decisions made from the empirical viewpoint. But what we are referring to now as **Shaastra Drishti (scriptural viewpoint) or Paramaartha Drishti (Absolute viewpoint)** is not of that kind; because it teaches the Ultimate Reality as It is only, there is no possibility whatsoever of the decision made on the strength of this viewpoint again being changed or amended. When the Ultimate Reality is cognized according to this viewpoint, it becomes indisputable that our Atman is truly deathless. It will become quite certain that statements made by the scriptural texts regarding *Brahman* who is our *Atman or Self*, like - "Afraid (of Him) Death keeps on running" (*Taittireeya* 2-8), "To Him even Death is pickles" (*Katha* 1-2-25), (One who cognizes that essential nature of Being) "That mortal being becomes immortal" (*Brihadaaranyaka* 4-4-7) etc. — are not dry flatteries or praises but are the real statements of facts.

(B) The Greatness of Vedantic Knowledge

12. The benefits accruing from the teaching that our Atman or Self alone is the Atman or essence of Being of the entire universe :

To those students who keep as their goal what we have stated so far, viz , that the Ultimate Reality or Absolute

Rarest Archive

Essence of Being of this universe is *Brahman* alone and that when viewed from the Absolute standpoint our *Atman* is *Brahman* alone; another special feature of the philosophical science of Vedanta will flash in the mind. That is: Because the fact that '*Brahman* is not only our *Atman or Self* but also is the *Atman* of the entire universe itself' is established in this philosophical science, it means the same whether it is stated that one should know the essential nature of *Atman* or that one should know the essence of Being of the entire universe. For this reason alone, it is propagated in the scriptural texts that if after listening to the subject-matter of *Atman* one ratiocinates or Intuitively reasons out and cognizes, then "what is not heard of also becomes that which is heard of, what is not discriminated about also becomes that which is discriminated about, what is not cognized (or Intuitively known) also becomes that which is cognized" (*Brihadaaranyaka* 2-4-5, *Chaandogya* 6-1-3); "Just as, if the reality of one lump of clay is cognized or known, the essential nature of all those things like pitcher, a plate and a pot etc. which are made out of clay becomes known, similarly if *Atman* or the essential nature of Being of this universe is cognized, everything becomes known only" (*Chaandogya* 6-1-4). Thus, in order to indicate that the (Intuitive) knowledge of the essential nature of our Being is Itself the knowledge of the entire universe, this knowledge is being called variously by names like "**Brahma Jnaana**". "**Atma Jnaana**", "**Brahmaatma Jnaana**". To the doubt as to how at all does it become possible that merely knowing the essential nature of our *Atman or Self* we come to know the essence of Being of everything, a solution will become clear or evident by itself in due course. From this, it also becomes evident as to how insupportable is the allegation that Vedantins are a group of selfish-minded people who are concerned about their own Emanci-

Rarest Archive

pation, being unconcerned about others or having given up the thought of others; because, in the discriminative thinking about *Atman* that the Vedantins carry out all the deliberations about topics like — the essential nature of the phenomenon of *Jeeva* (soul) or *Jeeva Tattwa,* the essential nature of the phenomenon of the universe or *Prapancha Tattwa,* the essential nature of the phenomenon of the Creator or Lord or *Ishwara Tattwa,* the essential nature of the phenomenon of Self-knowledge or *Jnaana Tattwa,* the essential nature of morals or ethics or *Neeti Tattwa,* the essential nature of meditations or *Upaasana Tattwa,* the essential nature of the ultimate goal or purpose of human existence or *Purushaartha Tattwa* — are included.

If it is remembered that Vedanta is a philosophical science which determines the reality of everything, the difference between the other schools of philosophy and this philosophical science will stand out, as also the greatness of this philosophical science will be seen budding out and blooming forth. To wit, **first of all**, Vedanta is not a faith; even so, in it too are available reasonings or dialectics which are utilized to establish its main teachings or tenets which are like the supporting pillars to all other faiths. **Secondly**, Vedanta is not a logical science or system of dialectics; even so, in it also it is depicted or delineated, after bringing home the (Intuitive) experience which is the foundation for irrefutable logic, that the empirical dialectics has limitations. **Thirdly**, the teachings of Vedanta do not stand on the support of any extra-ordinary experience whatever or on the support of any regimen ; even so, it analytically clarifies all the secrets of things like the experiences of Yogis, the emotional or mental states of contemplators or meditators, the mythologies of various

Rarest Archives

faiths and religious rites etc. **Fourthly**, Vedanta does not stand on the validity or evidence of the scriptures at all ; even so, the scientific basis of common evidence or proofs as well as the foundation of the scriptural testimony or validity are explained like being pointed by a finger. **Fifthly**, Vedanta has not arranged or formulated its teachings in accordance with the system of investigation of the physical sciences; even so, it provides several special ways or exercises of reasoning which will strengthen the very foundation of the common discoveries or laws of the physical sciences. Thus, the empirical benefits or utilities are many as well as they are also desirable to all of us.

13. The permanent impact of effect on human life or living brought about by Vedanta :

Hearing our statement that Vedanta is not only in agreement with all empirical and Vedic (scriptural) treatises but also is the life-giving source to all of them, it should never be assumed that this philosophical science is beneficial only to those who have a knowledge of the scriptural texts. It is true that other schools of philosophy which are predominantly based on logic or dialectics are not accessible (intelligible) to the ordinary (common) people ; but the subject-matter of Vedanta is not like that. For, the topics of Vedanta like *Karma* (religious acts or duties), *Punya Paapa* (religious merits and demerits), *Janmaantara* (other births or rebirth), *Bandha Moksha* (human bondage and emancipation) etc. are being discussed by present-day (modern) people ; because, they are indeed deliberations pertaining to subject-matters which every one can adopt or observe in his living (as a way of life). The wise can carry out any amount of ratiocination on

Rarest Archive

arguments as regards these subject-matters and can achieve satisfaction intellectually; the dull-headed can thrive in this life with a sound moral outlook and happiness by merely believing in these matters and can look forward to a more prosperous condition in 'the other worlds'. The philosophical or spiritual thinkers who founded the schools of philosophy predominantly based on logic or dialectics are those who exhibited the excellence and calibre of their intellect only, but it cannot be said that they have brought about any beneficial effect whatsoever on human life by their system of deliberation or discrimination; it is difficult to say whether some among such spiritual reformers themselves changed their lives towards righteousness and perfection or not as a result of their own teachings. Even the names of some reformers belonging to the logic-oriented schools of philosophy are not to be found in the memory of the common people. On the other hand, there are enough of examples to show that the great souls, who had steadfast faith in and respect for Vedanta, had dedicated and sacrificed their entire life itself for the sake of this system of teaching. The soothing light and grace of their devotion, knowledge and renunciation used to fall on all those who were living in places around them and was providing happiness. If some of the moral sayings about holymen which are in vogue among the common people of our country are memorized it can be fully realized how in our country the scholars in the philosophical science were revered: "The Ganges removes demerit, the moon removes heat, the king removes poverty; but those who remove demerit, heat and poverty simultaneously are holymen only". "Sacred or holy places means not rivers, deities means not the idols of stone and clay, in truth, holymen alone are holy or sacred places

Rarest Archive

holymen alone are deities. The holy places with rivers and the deities installed in the idols purify people after the latter serve them for a long time; but the holymen liberate the people merely by their glimpse " Even today the seekers of the Ultimate Reality are remembering with reverential gratitude the *Rishis* or seers, who by God's grace visualized the Vedic hymns, as well as the names of those holymen, who not only deliberated upon and discussed the teachings of Vedanta and attained their Intuitive experience but also put them down in the form of treatises for the welfare of the world. What wonder is there in the fact that Vedanta, which can produce such an excellent effect on the behaviour and utterances of man, has deserved people's admiration? The tenets of this school of philosophy are replete in Sanskrit, the scriptural texts, the epics, the mythologies, poems, dramas etc., they have also spread everywhere having taken the forms of poems, songs, folklore, spiritual teaching, holy praises, proverbs in all Indian national languages. Wherever it may be, it is given honour and respect only; it is acknowledged by people of all ranks or levels, of all faiths or religions, of all castes, of all races and of all ages. So wonderful is its greatness!

14. The need for giving place of recognition for Vedanta in the present-day educational systems:

The physical sciences had not been born in the days or times of the sages who had propounded the truths of Vedanta philosophy. There is no evidence whatsoever to show that in those days there were mechanical devices like motor cars, railways, ships, aeroplanes, telegraphic systems, radio sets etc. as it is the case today, nor was

Rarest Archive

there any printing machinery which is the means for preserving as well as spreading knowledge ; nor was there any other special device used for dissemination of knowledge. The wonderful machines, which could produce in a wink's time commodities which were essential for people's health and their happy and comfortable living, were not at all available in those days ; there is no proof to show that there were international conventions which brought together all the nations of the world, or agitational devices which on the strength of party politics could very quickly and efficiently perform acts of great magnitude in the days of those sages. But there is no room for us to become arrogant and presumptuous to say that because those sages did not know the way to enjoy the mundane pleasures they had dabbled in spiritual deliberations or that to us who belong to the modern civilization their deliberations are of no utility whatsoever. Because, we have already stated that they sought solitude out of a sense of renunciation alone and not out of dissatisfaction. They have composed, out of a desire that everyone in the world should be happy, many types of scientific treatises, which are like veritable mines of knowledge, pertaining to the means of attaining happiness in this world and in the other worlds too. Having measured the three-fold aspects of life, viz. *Dharma* (religious duties), *Artha* (wealth), *Kaama* (worldly desires), from all standpoints, they have shown their limitations. In addition to this, those great men had sacrificed their entire span of life for the sake of the great penance alone of the nature of profound (or noble) deliberations like - "What is the secret of this eternally appearing world of sentient and insentient things ? Wherefrom and how did this world originate ? What is the relationship between this world and ourselves ? Is there an Ultimate Reality which is the substratum of all

Rarest Archive

this? If there is one, how can it be known?" The teachings of these great men are not expounded keeping any particular time or period or any particular place, region or country as the main basis; they are quite essential at all times to each and every person in this universe. Though we are admiring ourselves thinking that we who belong to the modern times are highly intelligent and we are boasting, our intelligence or wisdom is like that of little children, who forgetting their self interests are loitering about wherever they like for pleasure or fun. Our scientific treatises remain mum without giving any answer at all to very important questions like: What is our essential nature of Being? Wherefrom have we come? Where are we destined to? etc. None of the inventions made through them (the modern scientific treatises) has helped us even a wee bit in attaining Self-knowledge. As and when these inventions have increased, it has become more and more convenient for moneyed people to keep the poor under the pressure of their feet by using these inventions, as also for strong men having powers in their hands to persecute the innocent and weak sections of the people. We, who feel proud that we are establishing all types of educational institutions spending crores and crores of rupees and are promoting dissemination of knowledge, have not brought out or founded even one single system of philosophical science which, having fully tested the doctrines or teachings of those sages of old and innovating a more powerful system of dialectics, can be firmly established as well as which can help bring peace to the common people. Let alone the fact that we have not progressed in these matters; we are looking upon the treasure itself, which those great men had discovered for our sake, with indifference saying that because those deliberations made by the ancient sages are extra-sensory they are beyond the realm of

Rarest Archive

science and because they are not concerned with human living one should not go anywhere near them ! What more ignominy than this can come to our times to which we have given the title of a 'scientific era' ?

For several reasons **the study of Upanishads and Vedanta** has decreased of late. Some people of our country, who - fascinated by the modern civilization or culture of the Westerners - started off with the intention of following that civilization or culture alone in all respects, were immersed in the examination of not only the food, attire, games, transactions etc. of those people but also their language, customs, systems of inquiry etc and forgot the fact itself that there is a certain culture which is distinct and special in our country only Under these circumstances, the deep study of the scriptures, epics, mythologies, philosophies etc. were denied to the higher strata of our society ; it fell to the lot of those who learn them merely for their livelihood alone. Stage by stage even to these small number of people there was no encouragement ,or patronage and a time came when they had to pursue this kind of subject - matters in the same manner as a person who sustains his life by gulping down a few drops of water Swindlers, who enticed women, old people, and illiterate people, who were liable or susceptible to cling to old sentiments and emotions in blind faith, and who by assuming various names like 'Vedantins', 'ascetics', 'sages', 'mystics' etc. deceived and held complete sway over them, increased.

But at the right time when we degenerated into this kind of a sorry state which made one shed tears, by

Rarest Archive

divine dispensation there arose in our country another kind of awareness. The shadow of some dispassionate Western scholars, who having carried out research as regards the ancient glory and heritage of India presented its profundity and nobility before the world at large, fell on us. As a result of this our people were awakened and are showing an ambition to search once again every nook and corner of the culture or heritage of our country. As in the case of other matters, so also in the case of the discr.minative study of Vedantic teachings many excellent books in foreign languages, Sanskrit and regional languages have been published in recent times. Several great men who feel that Vedanta is not inferior to any Western school of philosophy as also that it is their duty to study it thoroughly and present its greatness before the people of the world are arduously working for this purpose But this alone is not enough The pride that "the spiritual or philosophical science which is the treasure trove of the Indian nation is ours" should manifest itself among all Hindus, nay all Indians ; it should be realized by all of us that the teachings of this spiritual science of Vedanta are needed now by humanity in general, more then ever before; if we wish to be called or addressed as educated intellectuals deserving honour, the fact that we should all aspire to secure for this philosophical science of Vedanta a place it deserves in all the educational systems formulated in our country should loom large before our eyes

Rarest Archives

(C) Who Are Those Qualified Or Fit For The Vedantic Discrimination?

15. All are fit persons indeed if they have the capability of discrimination and the desire to know Vedantic teachings or philosophy :

It has already been stated that in the Vedantic philosophy there is discrimination or deliberation about the Ultimate or Absolute Reality It has also been stated that as It is the *Atman or Self* of the entire universe It is the *Atman or Self* of us also. It being so, it becomes self-evident that whosoever has the ambition to know his *Atman*, his essential true nature of Being, all such people are the qualified ones for this discrimination. Whosoever has the desire to do the discriminative thinking about *Atman or the Self*, whosoever has the necessary qualification or capability of carrying out the discrimination — all those people are fit persons for this indeed. Even so, it is necessary for us to know what special qualification is needed for the discrimination about *the Self* or the Ultimate or Absolute Reality. Some people keep on saying that because the *Upanishads* alone are the main source for the Vedantic philosophy, as the *Upanishads* are the scriptural texts (*Shruti*), women, the heathens or menials and foreigners who are not qualified to study the scriptural texts are not fit for this discrimination. This opinion of theirs seems to us as not correct. *Atman or the Self* means one's essential nature of Being; the statement that 'one does not have the qualification or authority even to know one's own essential nature of Being through discrimination has no meaning whatsoever. Even when seen from the standpoint of the classification of the four castes (*Varnas*) and four

Rarest Archive

stages of life (*Ashramas*), as stipulated in the authoritative texts, although only the twice-borns i.e. persons belonging to the first three castes, are qualied for the study of the scriptural texts, i. e. Vedas, all are qualified to perform the duties or rites mentioned in the Vedas according to their respective qualifications But what we have taken up now for consideration is neither the study of the Vedas or scriptures nor the observance or performance of religious duties or rites, but the discrimination about the intrinsic nature of our Being mentioned in the Vedanta texts (*Upanishads*) Nowhere have the authors of our scriptural texts stated that 'any one who has the right qualifications has no authority for this discriminative consideration'. If they state like that, then it will not be in agreement at all with reason. Those who can study the *Upanishads* and through them who can directly ratiocinate can only do so ; those that cannot do that can hear the mythological texts etc. and through them can carry out the discrimination; those who cannot do that even can acquire the necessary knowledge through the texts in national or regional languages themselves and can carry out the discrimination. It need not be gainsaid at all that, because for the discrimination about the essential nature of one's own Being Intuitive experience alone is the final stage to be reached in the ultimate analysis, the ability as well as the desire to carry out the discrimination in consonance with Intuitive experience is most essential.

16. The, four-fold disciplines which are invariably essential for the qualified protagonists of Vedanta :

Here we have not called those who read the scriptual texts out of curiosity to find out as to what subject-matter is

Rarest Archive

expounded by this philosophical science the qualified people. The truly qualified people for this are only those discriminating ones who have the supreme dedication and sincerity of knowing, at all costs, this essential nature of the Ultimate Reality mentioned here. Such people are called **Mumukshus** (those who aspire to get rid of the shackles of ignorance or nescience) by Vedantins. It is quite natural to say that only those, who have staunchly believed that for all ills and miseries that are caused to us in this world ignorance of the essential nature of Being or *the Self* alone is the cause and that the remedy for getting released or liberated from them is to know (Intuitively experience) the essential nature of the Ultimate·Reality or *the Self* alone, are the only people who can be said to carry out the Vedantic discrimination with dedication and sincerity. **Vairaagya** or a sense of renunciation of the nature of - "If there is an entity called the Ultimate Reality, I will sacrifice or renounce anything whatsoever for Its sake" – is necessary in the aspirants or seekers. To those who have a strong attachment (or fascination) towards other objects, an extra-ordinary desire to know the Ultimate Reality will not arise. **Viveka** or discriminative thinking (or reasoning) of the nature of – "As the Ultimate Reality alone subsists at all times, it is not at all right or proper to discard the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality for the sake of the enjoyment of this life of mere three days" – is complementary to *Vairaagya*. In addition to this, Vedantins say that the following six disciplines are invariably necessary for those who aspire to attain the knowledge (Intuition) of the Ultimate Reality at all costs: *Shama* (keeping the mind in control), *Dama* (keeping the senses in control), *Uparati* (avoiding to undertake any other dealing or transaction ; making this discriminative thinking alone

Rarest Archives

about the Ultimate Reality as one's main idea or purpose), *Titiksha* (tolerating or putting up with equipoise the rise and fall of happiness and misery or pleasures and pains and keeping the mind immersed in the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality), *Shraddha* (having no misunderstanding or wrong opinion whatsoever about the teachings or tenets mentioned in the *Upanishads* and looking upon that subject-matter with reverence and respect), *Samaadhaana* (attempting or endeavouring to establish the mind in the contemplation about the Ultimate Reality alone). It is easy for all of us to agree that it is necessary for the intellect to be imbued with a power or faculty of discrimination if one has to deliberate upon the Ultimate Reality. But the fact that for this what necessity there is of disciplines like *Shama, Dama* etc. does not flash to us so fast or quickly. Though this fact will be known only at the end of all discriminative considerations, here at present this much can be stated: Whatever be the deliberations we make, each one of them pursues a direction in accordance with the latent impressions (*Vaasanas*) embedded in the mind. It is the common experience to see that even those, who are adepts in dialectics or deliberations, as a result of the pressure of the latent impressions in their mind adopt a dubious or wrong path and draw their own conclusions. Therefore, disciplines like *Shama, Dama* etc. are quite essential. It is the opinion of Vedantins that those who are endowed with the four qualifications, which we have explained so far, viz. *Viveka, Vairaagya,* the six-fold disciplines like *Shama, Dama* etc. and *Mumukshutwa,* will certainly attain directly and in this birth itself the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality as delineated in Vedanta and can live

Rarest Archives

with Bliss. It has to be realized by the readers as to how much truth exists in this statement as they go through the next portion of this book.

II. DISCRIMINATION ABOUT THE ULTIMATE REALITY

(A) The Viewpoint of the Three States of Consciousness

17 Vedantins do not consider the three states from the viewpoint of the means of knowledge :

We have delineated in the previous Chapter that among all the attempts made to cognize the Ultimate Reality or *Atman* the Vedantic philosophy, which is based on the teachings of the *Upanishads*, has earned its own unique position, and for that highest position the reason is the fact that that philosophy has followed the complete or comprehensive viewpoint alone. Because the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness alone (This has been stated because of the opinion that in the methodology of Superimposition and Rescission the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness alone is important, Refer to sub-section No. 6) is the comprehensive viewpoint the philosophic system that is formulated on the basis of this viewpoint alone is in consonance with Intuitive experience as well as dialectical

Rarest Archive

logic, whereas the viewpoint of the remaining schools of philosophy is non-comprehensive or partial, and for this reason alone they (the various other philosophies) have not found firm ground. This fact we have stated. We will explain to some extent in this Chapter questions like: What is the essential nature of this viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness ? What is the unique feature to be found in this viewpoint other than in the remaining viewpoints (of the other schools of philosophy) ? What is the justification to say that this alone is the complete or comprehensive viewpoint ? What is that system of discrimination that is formulated in this (Vedantic) philosophy by following this viewpoint (of the three states) ? What are those important conclusions that are skimmed out of this discrimination ?

In the first place, it is essential to state a couple of facts regarding **the essential nature of the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness.** Whether it is the physical sciences or the other schools of philosophy or religion, in all of them the three states have not been given predominance; on the other hand, the perceptual instruments (i. e. senses) alone have been given greater value or importance. The physical scientists as well as the philosophers or thinkers are immersed only in the examination of the objects perceivable by the senses. Both these classes of people opine that the perceptual instruments alone are the important means which provide the objects for discrimination. It will not be wrong if it is said or taken that, because of the fact that howsoever microscopic or subtle appliances or instruments might be adopted they are all subsidiary instruments alone to the main instruments of perception, in the physical sciences perception or perceptual knowledge alone is the

Rarest Archives

main means of knowledge. Whether in the case of the physical scientists or in the case of the philosophers or thinkers, for the purpose of examination they have not taken into account anything whatsoever other than the objects which are either perceived by the senses or conceived by the mind. They establish or determine the truth after thoroughly examining, with the aid of microscopic or subtle instruments or appliances etc., those objects which are directly perceived by them through their senses and thereafter reconciling all the facts with the help of reasoning so that there is no contradiction among them. The physical scientists select objects section by section and then consider their particular forms or features, while the thinkers or philosophers take them (objects) all together and then consider their general or common forms or features. If this distinction is given up, both of them are similar only. **Perception (Pratyaksha) and Inference (Anumaana)**— using these means of knowledge is a common feature of both. In the religious studies or pursuits their respective devotion and faith as well as their particular individual experiences are predominantly considered by the people in general; for that consideration, realigious texts and their elders or well-wishers' statements (*Aaptavaakya*)– these are also taken into account as authentic or authoritative means. **In any case, perception (Pratyaksha), inference or deducing (Anumaana), elders' or well-wishers' statements (Aaptavaakya or Shabda) — using such means or instruments of knowledge, (Pramaanas) examining the objects of those means of knowledge comprise the methodology of all philosophers or thinkers other than Vedantins.** This conclusion can be drawn from the above facts. (Though the Idealists or *Vijnaanavaadins* include everything in intellectual knowledge, i.e. *Vijnaana,* and carry out their deliberations on the

Rarest Archive

Reality, they also somehow indirectly follow or adopt empirical means or instruments of knowledge only) But this is not the methodology of Vedantins. They do not consider the objects from the viewpoint of perceptual means or instruments of knowledge; they undertake to deliberate upon the total states of Consciousness which include or comprise both the means of knowledge (*Pramaanas*) and their objects (*Prameya*). **Vedantins do not visualize the states from the viewpoint of the means of knowledge; they cognize that the three states of Consciousness are their own states and carry out their deliberations.** This is the essential nature of the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness.

18. Special features of the viewpoint of the three states ;

A special feature of the viewpoint of the three states is that it gives the full value to **Intuition (Anubhava)** that it deserves and carries out its deliberations. Many people are of the opinion that through the aid of means like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*), elders' statement (*Shabda*) alone the examination of objects must be carried out. But, "How can the 'validity' of the valid means be determined ?"— if such a question is put to them, a satisfactory answer is not forthcoming from them. However, they argue out saying that this kind of a question is a meaningless (dialectical) question; besides, if the fundamental rule of examining through valid means is not accepted, no truth or reality whatsoever can be established or determined. This does not seem to be correct. Because, what one has observed through valid means and has determined, that same thing or truth itself is shown to be

Rarest Archive

wrong by another. In such a circumstance, the protagonists of valid means *(Pramaanavaadins)* may say that the logic or reasoning (*Tarka*) used in arriving at the conclusion will not be proper or correct; but in such circumstances the question— "How can it be established whether the non-determination of the truth was due to the defect in the use of valid means or due to the defect in the reasoning adopted?" – will still remain unanswered. But in the methodology of the three states of Consciousness this difficulty is not there at all. For, even those who say that whatever is established on the strength of the valid means alone is the Ultimate Reality have invariably to give value to the Intuitive experience alone born out of the valid means. Hence, the fact that one should undertake any inquiry by keeping this Intuitive experience alone, which is the substratum for even the valid means, as the most important factor is universally acceptable. This Intuitive experience exists in all the three states of Consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, and hence **it is essential for the comprehensive outlook or viewpoint to take into the reckoning, for deliberation, all these three states in order to comprehend the truth of the object that is known or objectified by the Intuition as well as the truth of Intuition itself.** Thus the fact that all the three states have to be considered is one special feature of this viewpoint. It is evident from this that when carrying out the analytical examination of the three states, if all the things belonging to any particular state are not included in that particular state, then the conclusion drawn will be incomplete or partial. Vedantins have realized this fact also. This is the second special feature of this viewpoint. Further, if after examining all the three states still a state different from these states remains or subsists, then also the system of philosophy will be incomplete or partial. But

Rarest Archive

as it is being shown in this Vedantic philosophy (Refer to sub-section No. 40 towards the end of this Chapter) that there is no state which is not included or subsumed within the three states of Consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, in this respect also this viewpoint is complete. **These three special features** which have been briefly mentioned here will be fully discussed and determined in this Chapter. Because these three special features are there (in their philosophical science) Vedantins say that **the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness alone is the complete or comprehensive one.**

19. The methodology of Vedanta :

The methodology of the viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness adopted or followed by Vedanta is a unique feature of this philosophy. Because, there are only three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, and if we examine these three states and reconcile all the Intuitive experiences gained therefrom, **then the complete or comprehensive Truth or the Absolute Reality will necessarily be known as It is** When the states are individually considered, the question whether the Intuitive knowledge gained therefrom is right or wrong cannot be solved only from such (partial) consideration; whether that Intuitive knowledge will sustain itself till the end or not ? – if this question is to be determined, then that partial Intuitive knowledge is to be combined with and compared to the remaining Intuitive experiences or knowledges (gained from the examination of the other two states) and have to be sifted thoroughly. **Thus after sifting (all these partial Intuitive experiences) the conclusions drawn by**

Rarest Archive

us are alone final, irrevocable and infallible. This fact is to be proved or established in accordance with dialectical logic. The fact that in Vedantic philosophy all these methods have been followed is itself a unique feature of its methodology.

20. The conclusion drawn from the Vedantic discrimination :

The important conclusion that emerges after carrying out deliberations based on the viewpoint of the three states is : **The real essential nature of our Self (Atman) Itself is Brahman, which is the essence of the whole universe.** This *Brahman* is the root cause of the existence, knowledge and happiness seen in our universe. In this (*Brahman*) alone the whole world of matter (*Dravya*), qualities (*Gunas*) and actions (*Karma*) appears. Those who cannot cognize this Reality take up that part of this world which is comprehended by their intellect and having examined that part they have prepared various physical sciences. In all the religions which have come and gone in this world till today, what is called objectively 'the Lord' (*Ishwara*) is in truth this *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality alone; in those religions, for all the benevolent qualities assigned to the Lord, for whatever good virtues seen in the world as well as all good or virtuous deeds this *Brahman or Atman, the Self* alone is the substratum. Even so, in Its essential nature this *Brahman* is devoid of any kind of distinctions or differences, qualities, actions or relationships whatsoever. The Intuitive knowledge of this Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* alone is the prime

Rarest Archives

purpose of human life, its fulfilment. There is no human purpose whatsoever that is not gained from this knowledge (of *the Self or Atman*).

(B) The Need For Discrimination On All The Three States Of Consciousness

21. In Nature all the three states have been given recognition :

Those who have started to determine the essential nature of the Reality of the entire universe should not get satisfied by examination of one part of that world only. Similarly, it becomes self-established that it is not enough if the experience of one state alone is deliberated upon in order to determine the essential nature of the truth of all our experiences. Even so, for some reason or other, we have naturally a greater sense of identification in, or affinity towards, the waking state alone. All of us naturally feel that: "The world that is seen by us in the waking state alone is the one that we have to deliberate upon. That (world) is assuming new forms day by day. Every moment in that world innumerable creatures are getting born as well as many are dying; among such numerous creatures we are also one group. Though the part of this world which is available (accessible) to us is too small, as long as we live

Rarest Archives

or exist to utilize in our daily transactions whatever is available to us and whatever is known to us will be beneficial to us. But from the deliberation or discrimination on the dream and deep sleep states how can the truth of this world be known ? What is deep sleep ? Is it not a leisure or respite that is attained because of the result of some strain caused to the nervous system by any of the causes like over-eating. over-drinking or over-working?"

But the fact that this opinion is formed by the lop-sided view of the subject-matter will become clear as we deliberate a little upon it. Because, all the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep are experienced equally by all human beings in the same manner as they are experienced by all creatures. If man needed only the waking, why did God create dream as well as deep sleep at all ? If deep sleep is mere leisure, then one who has worked less should get less sleep, one who has worked more should get more sleep; children who have not done any work at all should get the least amount of sleep; old people who have slogged for many days and who desire to have leisure or respite should get more sleep than the others. But what is the truth ? Even the lazy people get sleep, while the old people get less sleep at night. Children at birth mostly are sleeping only. People, who had good sleep, when they wake up their enthusiasm and enterprise increase; they are endowed with health. **Hence, deep sleep is not mere leisure. It is evident that in deep sleep also there is some special feature which is very essential to us.** Similarly, dream is not the mere result of the unnatural change in the nervous system; because, even those who are very frugal in their eating and enjoyments and who are in a healthy state get dreams.

Rarest Archive

Because both deep sleep and dream keep on coming to us even if we do not want them also and because they come to us quite naturally without being subject to our desire to have them in a particular manner only, we will have to say that they also, like the waking, are very essential to us. Therefore, **it will be proper to opine that deep sleep and dream are independent states created for some good purpose for our sake alone,** instead of considering them as dependent states which cause or create facilities or difficulties or hardships required by the waking state.

22. All the three states must be considered alike :

When the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep are all experienced by us only, to consider that waking alone is ours and to show a 'step-motherly love' towards dream and deep sleep – these outlooks are not proper. It is true that things seen in the waking are useful only in the empirical transactions within the waking state, but are not the appearances seen in the dream useful in the transactions within the dream? Just as that which is seen in the dream is of no use whatsoever, in the same manner what is seen in the waking is of no utility in the dream; though this is a fact, to give greater value to waking and to degrade the dream, the cause can be said to be only the vain pride that one has about the waking. But it will not be proper to say that it is befitting the pride of having known the Ultimate Reality. One more thing. In deep sleep we remain without having any transactions, while in waking we are carrying out all sorts of transactions. In dream it appears as if there are all sorts of transactions. It being so, to carry out transactions is our nature and to remain

Rarest Archive

without any transactions is unnatural - such is our common conception. For this, what cause can be mentioned other than our greater affinity towards the waking ? However-much in our daily transactions we may be very highly benefited by waking, but if there is an ambition to determine the Ultimate Reality, then it is clear from this that we have to practise, first of all, considering the experiences of all the three states which are our own with a common vision (dispassionately), i.e. with equal importance given to all the three states which are universally everybody's experiences.

23. Defects in the system of discrimination of people who do not adopt the viewpoint of the three states :

If the greatness of the path of the three states is to be signified, it will be necessary to focus the attention on some of the defects that are inherent in the system of reasoning or discrimination of those who do not follow that path. **The physical sciences** give predominance to the waking state, observe the world from an objective view-point and after dividing it into different parts they are carrying out their examination. For that reason alone, in those sciences there is no hope for going beyond the nuclear atom or any other subtler objective part of the materialistic external world or the ego of the internal world. Similarly, the Western thinkers or philosophers have given predominance to the waking and have begun their deliberations about the Reality. The physical scientists, as they have kept in view mainly the objects alone, carry out their calculations in accordance with their examinations and experiments and come to one particular,

Rarest Archive

tentative conclusion, at least, which is acceptable to the majority of people. Although this conclusion may change from time to time, because all the physical scientists have one viewpoint only there is scope, at least, for their conclusion to appear to be in conformity to a large number of people. But because of the fact that for the thinkers or philosophers dialectical logic alone is predominant and because of the fact that among them each one adopts a different viewpoint alone and then reasons or argues out, it has not been possible for all of them to follow only one opinion, nor is it possible to say whether their science is progressing or regressing (degenerating).

Barring this much difference, there is no other big or small distinction between the system of discrimination adopted by the physical or material scientists and that of the thinkers or philosophers. For both of them the waking alone is predominant; that state alone is the one state which indicates or signifies the truth or reality. The essential nature of the other two states they do not consider at all, or even if they consider, they will examine them from the viewpoint of the waking alone and evaluate them. Many thinkers opine that waking and dream are states of different levels of existence or being; they think that while dream visions are mere appearances, deep sleep is of no consequence and expound the truth of the waking world according to their whims and fancies. There is no possibility whatsoever of the deliberation on the Reality ever reaching finality in their system or method. For this reason only, many people have begun to say that it is not a thing possible for the philosophers or thinkers to find out the Reality or essence of this universe and that philosophy or

Rarest Archive

spiritual science is the product of the vain or perverse dialectics of idle people, and (further they say) that from that philosophy there is no benefit whatsoever to the world. Some among the thinkers and philosophers have acknowledged that in this science (of the Spirit or Essence of Being) it is not possible to arrive at a final determination or declaration, and are saying that just like the material or physical sciences this spiritual science too grows as and when the deliberations or reasoning grows. Really speaking, there is no defect whatsoever in the spiritual science; it is not proper to think that the defect of not following or adopting a suitable system of discrimination required by that science as the defect or short-coming of that science. The Ultimate Reality will emerge only when to the Intuitive experiences of the waking the Intuitive experiences of the remaining states of dream and deep sleep are conjoined or correlated and viewing them with a dispassionate or impartial outlook the Reality is sifted out, but in the deliberations on things known from a partial viewpoint the people will never achieve unanimity.

24. There are topics to be deliberated upon in all the three states :

To realize the fact that in the case of all the three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, deliberations have to be carried out in the same manner is very essential for the discrimination of the Ultimate Reality In the waking we, the knowers, are there, objects- the known are there, the instruments of knowledge are there; the agents of action or doers — we, the means or instruments of action, the objects- all these are there: we, the experiencers

Rarest Archive

of pleasure and pain (or happiness and misery), the objects or things which are instumental for our happiness or grief, happiness and grief or misery which are the results of experiencing or enjoying those objects — all these are also there. Hence, in the waking the objective world — full of the diversity of things like knowledge, existence (being), action, agent of action, the fruit of action, enjoyment,-happiness, misery or grief etc.- is visible to us; now what is the essence or reality of this phenomenon ? What is the reality or essential nature of the 'I' notion which is the centre of all these things ? What is the reality of the differences among them as well as the reality of the natural relationships among them ? We have to deliberate upon the waking including all these aspects in it.

All the thinkers or philosophers have more or less accepted these aspects. But people who question in the manner — What is there to deliberate upon or consider (in detail) regarding dream and deep sleep ? — and discard them are many. If we patiently examine a little, we will realize that there are many things to be known in their case also. Even as we are carrying out transactions in the objective world, which we believe to be so wonderful in the waking, suddenly or abruptly, at a particular moment of time we get into deep sleep and all this is erased out without the least remnant, How strange ! Then the wonderful vision of our world, the enthusiastic interest that we were taking in it and the desires etc. which are the cause for all our empirical transactions — where do all these go ? Then at that moment where and in what form do they exist ? At that moment with what essential nature do we exist ? What

Rarest Archive

is the essence of that magnificent force or power which everyday deprives us of this world as well as its transactions and produces a certain experience which is extremely queer, distinct from this and which cannot possibly be described ? Again, by which cause do we leave behind that state and come back again ? What is the relationship between waking and deep sleep ? These and such other points are there to be deliberated upon in the case of deep sleep.

Now, if we turn our attention towards the dream, see what type of a queer, diverse vision it is ! Not a single thing of this world, even the least bit, has entered it. Even so, there, as if it is only a replica of this world, another world itself having (within its fold) all things like time, space, cause, effect, instrumental cause, result, knowledge, happiness, misery etc. is created afresh in a flash, faster than the time taken to bite a betel nut. What a great wonder this is ! It is true that all of us keep on saying that the phenomenon of dream is all an illusion of the mind and that there is no stuff in it; but yet, by the mere appearance of the dream we are deluded and without being able to know or understand that it is only a dream therein we feel that every thing is real alone. What a wonder this ! To which magician does this magnificent excellence by which this hypnotic spell is daily cast on everyone of us and such a wonderful vision shown, belong ? Who is it that projects such visions before us in that dream which we can never imagine or ever see in the waking ? Why do we take part on that 'dramatic stage' even without our knowledge ? How is it that some objects seen in the dream are similar to those in the waking alone; in fact, they seem to be of the waking

Rarest Archive

only? What is the relationship between the objects of the waking and those things ? Although every day when we see the dream it appears to be true only, when we wake up we determine it to be an illusion only — what is the reason for this ? There is no rule or regularity regarding the question that dreams are only so many (in number); even so, when witnessing each and every dream it appears as if that its experience itself is with us always; how strange ! How is it possible ? — These and such other points are to be deliberated upon in the case of the dream.

This fact is clearly evident now that 'only after deliberating upon the above - mentioned experiences of the three states and reconciling each one of them the all-pervasive Ultimate Reality or that 'Entity' which manifests in all the three forms of waking, dream and deep sleep can possibly be found out, but if the waking alone is considered the Ultimate Reality of the world can never be obtained'.

(C) The Special Features Of The Discriminative Method Of The Three States Of Consciousness

25 The need for this discriminative method :

It is clear from the explanations or descriptions mentioned so far that the discrimination about the three states

Rarest Archiver

is the unique or special feature of the Vedantic philosophical system. By the deliberation made so far it is realized, to some extent, that there is a need for carrying out discrimination on all the three states and that if the waking alone is considered predominantly how the discrimination would become incomplete or partial. Now it is essential to know as to which are the special features of the discriminative method of the three states, by boosting up the essential nature of the method of the three states a little further. For, even though all the three states are taken into the reckoning, if they are not viewed from the proper standpoint it amounts to taking recourse to a wrong path only with regard to the examination of the object or the subject-matter before us. To give an analogy — a judge might have examined all the people, who have been brought for legal transactions or proceedings before him, as their witnesses by the plaintiff and the respondent, respectively; he might have even read and examined all the letters and legal documents brought by both the parties; but if the judge has not noticed the difference in the relative merits of the witnesses as well as the documents in a clear lucid manner after a proper or thorough comparative study; or even though he has comparatively studied them, if he has not utilized a more comprehensive reasoning to arrive at the proper or true situation on the basis of those documents, his inquiry will not serve any purpose from the point of view of the determination of the truth, is it not? In the same manner, if the aspirants have not examined all the three states with the proper viewpoint, or after having examined, if they have not utilized more comprehensive reasoning methods of unifying the remaining strong Intuitive experiences, their discriminative method would not be the proper means of determining the Ultimate Reality, and

Rarest Archive

thereby it would not be deserving the great or famous name of 'the method of the three states of Consciousness, (*Avasthaatraya Prakriya*). Although in other countries thinkers do not consider the examination of the three states as one important part or aspect of their discriminative system, several Indian philosophers have carried out the discrimination of these states. But they have not paid any attention to the special features of this method and have reasoned out or deliberated according to their own respective ways devised by themselves and have also added to them different dialectics which are not enough for a comprehensive outlook. For that reason only the ultimate result (Truth) which they should have attained from this discrimination was denied to them. Hence, it is essential to deliberate and decide first as to what are the special or important features of this method, so that one does not lose the track in this method of the three states and follow a digressive route to fall into an abyss.

26. The expansiveness or pervasiveness of the states :

To know the expansiveness or pervasiveness of the states properly is the first special feature of the discriminative method of the three states. To observe the states and discriminate about them means whatever is witnessed in the states — all that is to be taken *en masse* (rolled up into one mass) and is to be made an object to one's Intuition, i.e. the essence of Being as the Witness or *the Self*, and then discriminate. To do this is very difficult for people who lack the habit of discrimination. Common people believe that: "No one knows when this world came into being and when it will end its existence; its expansiveness is beyond

Rarest Archives

the grasp of anybody's imagination; its new changes are taking place all the time with such speed that they are beyond the reach of the intellect of even the greatest adept in predicting. Thus in this world, which is seen to be eternal with space, time and changing things, I was born in a corner several years ago, grew and am roaming about; after some time I will die, will leave this world and go. In this beginningless, endless, eternal flow of the world my span of life is like the life-span of an air-bubble which is born now in a sea and bursts in another moment. To witness the beginning or the end of this world, or to fathom its depth and then determine its true nature and pronounce the final judgment about it is a task never possible". This is the belief of many people.

But if properly examined, what is this world ? Is it not the totality of the objects alone seen in our waking ? When we are awake all this is seen spread out; the moment we go to sleep it 'hides' itself somewhere. Such being the situation, what reason is there to believe that this world exists by itself independently and we exist in it ? It is true that it appears to us that our body and the senses embedded in it, the vital force or *Praana* and mind are all existing within this world; but is it a fact that our waking is occurring in this world ? Is it proper to say that the world, which is seen when there is waking and which disappears when it (waking) is not there, itself exists within the waking state, or is it proper to believe that when the waking is not there, even then the world exists by itself ? If these questions are deliberated upon paying a little attention, we get the following answers : The natural meaning that we have given to the word, "waking", is limited as

Rarest Archiver

well as opposed to actual fact. If properly examined, **waking** means not merely the state of my mind which is within the world, but, on the other hand, it is a fact that all that is objectified by my senses and mind is included within this waking state alone. All that I, with my senses, hear, see, smell, touch and taste; with my mind — all that I can experience, all that I can imagine and all that I can conceive — all these are included in this waking state. Human beings, animals, things, sun, moon, stars, deities, evil spirits and dead souls, the conceptions in poems and novels or the imaginary worlds with imaginary people, animals and things conceived by mentally deranged people; not only these, in addition to these our body vital force (*Praana*), mind, intellect, ego — all these are conjoined into this state of waking — (*Maandukya Bhaashya 3*). So expansive or pervasive is this viewpoint of the state ! To take all this into the reckoning is **the first special feature of the path or method of the discrimination of the three states of Consciousness.**

27. The worlds appearing in waking and dream are confined to their respective states alone :

As soon as we realize or discover this pervasive nature of the waking state our viewpoint based on our indiscriminative nature becomes topsy turvy. Instead of realizing, as we have generally or commonly understood it to be, that our waking occurs in the world, the fact that "this thing called 'the world' itself is of the nature of appearing in our waking" flashes in our mind. The fact that our dreams are many and the worlds, which appear in each of those dreams, are confined to the respective dream alone is very

Rarest Archives

clear, indeed. Thus the great teaching that the worlds which appear in waking and dream are restricted by, or confined to, their respective states alone is to be remembered. **This is the second special feature of the method of the three states of Consciousness**.

Generally among many of us even after the fact that 'the world is subordinate to the state' is enunciated, that does not become trustworthy. Instead, we naturally believe that the thing called the 'external world' is itself the substratum for all our states. To believe in the manner that — "Whether I am awake or asleep, the phenomenon called the 'external world' always exists by itself; apart from myself, in this world there are other human beings, animals, birds, plants etc., and inanimate or insentient things existing. The different states of childhood, youth, adolescence and old age as well as the states of waking, dream and deep sleep come to me one after the other in this world alone" — seems itself to be true to each one of us. Without discerning the essential natures' of the three states in accordance with what we observe in them, (our natural habit of) taking a predominant identification with the waking state alone has become the cause for this belief. But if it is examined dispassionately (i.e. without this predominant identification with the waking state view-point alone), then the unsoundness or impropriety of this belief will at once be observed or realized. For, in the first place what we call 'the world' is not at all the world in its entirety; that is only one part of the world restricted to the perception of the senses, but how are we knowing the senses? How are we knowing at all the mind which experiences the happiness or grief occurring within us?

Rarest Archive

Can the external part of the world which is perceived by the senses ever engulf within itself the thing called 'the waking state' which has kept in its womb this part of the world also that is within our body? Never. Similarly, we can never perceive with our waking senses the dream and the deep sleep; if it is so, where is the justification for imagining that those two states occur in this waking world alone? In each dream we perceive a different set of objects which seem to us as a world. Do we ever believe that that world has engulfed within itself the world of this waking state or this waking state itself? No. Day to day we experience many different dreams; do we ever believe that one among the worlds of those dreams exists somewhere even when its respective dream does not exist? Not at all. If it is so, what evidence is there to imagine that the waking world alone can exist independently apart from the waking state?

28. The greatness of Intuition :

Besides the testimonies or evidences of perception, inference, examples and elders' statements etc. (*Pratyaksha, Anumaana, Upamaana* and *Aapta Vakya or Shabda Pramaanas*) we need for our knowledge Intuitive experience also and to keep this fact in mind is **the third special feature of the method of the three states of Consciousness.** This fact has been made known to some extent in the above sub-section. Even so, it is essential to explain it further. For, common people are using in common parlance phrases like 'experience of the senses', 'experience of happiness and grief' to imply, by the term 'experience', other meanings also. But the knowledge

Rarest Archiver

or experience gained through the senses is called *'Aalochana'* in Sanskrit, meaning sensation, as seen in the scriptural texts. Therein the mental experiences or concepts of sound, touch, form, taste and smell are called by a different name — *Pratyaya* or cognition. It is better to adopt or accept the same names and meanings here also *'Pratyaya'* or cognition means a kind of knowledge or experience which flashes amidst the changes in the mind stuff which has assumed the form of the external object. *Samshaya* or doubting, *Nischaya* or determination, *Sambhaavana* or recognition, *Vipareeta Bhaavana* or misconception etc. — all these are the different forms only of the mental cognitive or perceptual experiences which we gain when we deliberate upon an external object. Further, we can call the experiences of happiness, grief, fear etc. which occur or are engendered in the mind alone and are of the nature of mental concepts by another name — *'Vedana'* or conceptual experiences. In this book we will use these technical terms enlisted above with these special connotations alone. When a man gets angry he has a conceptual experience or *Vedana* of anger (*Krodha*); when that anger subsides, that knowledge which the person forms with regard to that anger should be called the *'Pratyaya'* or cognition of anger. With what meaning the 'concept of anger' is said to be 'experience', with that same connotation or meaning 'the cognition of anger' cannot be called 'experience'— this fact is clear indeed. Although all that occurs (within us) in accordance with the objects is fit to be called 'experience' (*Anubhava*, meaning that which happens following something), when we have to bring to our mind different kinds of experiences and deliberate upon them, if each category of experience is named differently it facilitates our inquiry. What we have now begun to

Rarest Archives

enunciate as **'Anubhava'** or **Intuitive experience** is neither sensation (*Aalochana*), nor perceptual experience (*Pratyaya*) nor conceptual experience (*Vedana*). When we are awake we perceive external objects through our senses and then are experiencing the happiness or grief engendered by them, is it not ? The experience gained through the senses and the conceptual experience of happiness and grief — comprising these two experiences is the whole waking state, and how do we 'experience' that whole waking state ? The knowledge that 'we are awake now' is gained by us through the perceptual or cognitive experience alone; but how does the 'experience' which is the cause for this perceptual or cognitive experience occur ? Just as the perceptual knowledge of anger has the conceptual experience of anger as its cause, how does this 'experience' of waking occur ? This question we must fully ruminate over in our mind. If we investigate or deliberate upon the question — 'Through which senses or instruments of knowledge do we know or experience the waking state ?' — then we realize that, unlike the objects being known through the senses and the happiness and grief being experienced through the mind, we have no other instruments of knowledge whatsoever for 'the experience or knowledge of the waking state'. Just as we experience our dream and deep sleep directly (i.e. Intuitively) without the help of any instruments of knowledge like the senses, the mind etc., in the same manner we experience the waking directly without the need for any instrument of knowledge. Is it not ? This is a very important fact. For, in the other schools of philosophy more importance is given to the instruments of knowledge (like the senses, mind) alone; but **in the method of the three states of Consciousness which is followed in Vedanta, this Intuitive experience, which is the substratum for the instruments of**

Rarest Archives

knowledge, is itself considered as the highest among all the instruments of knowledge that we possess. In fact, because this Intuitive experience, which is the main foundation for the whole of the Science of Reality, was not taken into the reckoning, the teachings of the various schools of philosophy other than Vedanta have not been fully established. The discrepancies in their teachings born out of this main difference we will point out later on in this book at the relevant place.

29. The states have no relationship whatsoever with one another :

To keep in mind that the three states, i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep, have no relationship with one another and that they are mutually independent is **the fourth special feature of taking to this path or method.** The notions (about these three states) of common people are like : "Waking is the most important among all these three states; in this waking state alone all the real things exist. All that appears in the dream is mere false manifestation; there is no stuff in deep sleep." Thus not only do the ordinary people but also many philosophers have a pronounced predilection towards attaching greater value to the waking and then, with that waking standpoint, measuring the remaining two states. We will not become qualified or fit to explore the Reality unless we escape from the grip or clutches of this unjustifiable or unacceptable opinion (wrong notion) and discriminate (upon these states) independently (i.e. according to their own independent merits). If we give up this needless 'partiality' towards the waking and, as stated above in the previous section, if we observe

Rarest Archive

from the point of view of the Intuition (*Anubhava*), we will discern as follows: As these three states of waking, dream and deep sleep are our own experiences, among them when we have the experience of one state we do not have the experience of the remaining two; that means, when we have waking, we do not have dream and deep sleep; when we have dream, we do not have waking and deep sleep; when we have deep sleep, we do not have waking and dream. Although, either in the dream or in the waking, appearances seem to be outside ourselves at the time of the respective state, those things appearing are confined to the respective state alone; those things do not exist independently by themselves apart from the respective state. Therefore, when we leave one state and get another state, the past state leaves us completely and not a trace of its attachment or entanglement remains with us. Nor does this past state exist by itself anywhere else. If we ratiocinate in our mind that 'thus the three states appear to us independently by themselves without having any relationship with one another', then the verdict follows that we should determine the Reality after discriminative thinking based on a viewpoint which gives or adopts equal consideration for (i.e. giving equal status to) all the three states. The incomplete or partial viewpoint of giving greater value or importance to one state alone and neglecting the remaining two states gets far away from us.

30. The comprehensive reasoning that is utilized in the method of the three states;

We will mention one more special feature of this method of the three states, i.e. **the fifth special feature of**

Rarest Archive

this method, and then conclude this topic. Because there are three states and each one of them exists independently without desiderating the other two states, we cannot say that the reasonings which we have formulated on the basis of the experiences gained in any one of the states and which are hence applicable to the respective state alone should perforce be made applicable to the remaining states also. In our Intuitive experience if there is no other contradiction or falsification, then those reasonings can be made applicable to another state also; but if there is any contradiction seen, immediately we should consider that reasoning to be limited or partial reasoning. Because the questions — "What is the comprehensive reasoning that is applicable to all the states ? What is that partial reasoning which can be made applicable to one or two states only ?"— are to be determined in their respective contexts alone, there is no possibility of our taking up for consideration now all the reasonings which may crop up in due course. Even so, as examples one or two illustrations we will give here and proceed further. In the waking state any particular effect is born from a particular cause, desiderating fixed time and space conditions alone. For example, herein (in the waking) for a cow to become pregnant and then to deliver a calf, so many months are needed — such a regulation is there. But in the dream state it is not like this. There it may seem to us as if a cow became pregnant before our very eyes in a matter of five or six minutes and delivered the calf too. We all know it too well also that this sort of a thing or phenomenon is not contradictory whatsoever to the nature of the dream. When this is so if one argues, on the strength of his experiences gained in his waking, in the manner — "In the dream the cow did not at all deliver the calf, because it did not have enough time to deliver the

Rarest Archive

calf" — then it amounts to adopting a limited or partial reasoning. For, he has himself 'seen' in the dream the cow 'really' delivering the calf; even so, having rejected this from the point of view of his waking, he has argued that because there was no sufficient time needed the delivery of the calf is false. Instead of this, if another person argues in the manner — "In the dream it is a fact that the calf was delivered; but because it was an experience of the dream, the calf was born according to the regulations of the dream. For that reason alone, we did not encounter any contradiction in that regard in the dream" — then, he is the one who has utilized a comprehensive reasoning in keeping with his experiences. Similarly, to argue that- "In the dream as well as the waking, outside us there is invariably an appearance of some object or other; the deep sleep is also a state just like the waking and the dream and so in the deep sleep state also there should be perforce an object which is fit to be visible" — it will amount to a partial reasoning. If the fact that **the reasoning in keeping with Intuitive experience is a comprehensive reasoning, whereas the reasoning contradictory to one's Intuitive experience is partial reasoning** is kept in mind, then in any circumstance whatsoever we can evaluate any particular reasoning by such a test.

If the five special features mentioned so far by us are not forgotten, it will highly facilitate 'trekking on the highway of the three states of Consciousness'. Hereon we will state the all-embracing, satisfactory philosophical teachings which the Vedantins have formulated after having followed this hallowed path, as also the objections put up against

Rarest Archiver

this path by other protagonists who have not understood its secrets and the satisfactory answers given by Vedantins to such objections, by dividing them into different topics.

(D) The Objections And Satisfactory Answers Regarding The Method Of The Three States

31. The objections against the method :

The special features of the method of the three states which the Vedantins have utilized to determine the Ultimate Reality have been to some extent made familiar so far. Now we have to ponder over questions like — "What authoritative support is there to say that the viewpoint of the three states alone is the comprehensive viewpoint ?" Are there no objections against this method at all ?" Here we will take up the examination of some important objections which are likely to be made against the general applicability of the method : Without considering the wonderful world that is seen within the states, particularly the waking, at least to the extent we know it — (1) What gain is there in considering the states as separate entities ? (2) What is the defect, if at all there is any, in not considering the purposeless states of dream and deep sleep and in considering everything from the viewpoint of the

Rarest Archives

waking alone ? (3) People, who say that if all the three states are examined the Ultimate Reality can be found out, have baforehand to imagine that there is one 'Ultimate Reality', is it not ? What authority or support is there to imagine like that ? (4) Even if it is taken or reckoned that there is an Ultimate Reality, how can it be believed that it is possible for man to know that Ultimate Reality ? (5) Even if it is conceded that it is possible, what guarantee or assurance can be given that by the mere consideration of the three states alone that Ultimate Reality can be known ? (6) In case it is accepted that That (Ultimate Reality) can be known, how can it be said that that knowledge alone is the ultimate or final verdict ? These alone are the objections which we propose to take up for consideration in this section.

32. The subject-object division :

Let us examine the first objection, viz. "If the state itself as a whole is considered instead of considering the world within the state how at all can be the Ultimate Reality be known?" That 'the world which is within the state is to be observed' — is a statement made from the empirical viewpoint. People who are immersed in **the knowledge of the physical world or the empirical science** are giving too much predominance to this (materialistic) viewpoint From their point of view whatever knowledge man has accumulated amounts to : This phenomenon of the world (It may be said that now the physical sciences have changed their opinions with regard to the world or universe to a great extent. The opinions which the 19th Century physicists had formulated with regard to the material objects or

Rarest Archive

things in the world or universe, time and causation etc. have changed in many aspects. These new opinions or theories are, in many contexts, helpful or beneficial to the Vedantic discrimination; in certain other contexts, though their opinions may palpably appear to be contradictory or opposed, the readers can themselves conceive, on the strength of the discriminative method that we are going to delineate in this book in due course, that in truth there does not exist any oppsition or contradiction at all in these contexts too. In Appendix I at the end of this book, under the topic — "Science and Spirituality" we have examined some of these subject-matters in some detail. For the time being, however, here we will deliberate upon the opinions which are commonly adopted by the physical scientists or physicists as they are called today) exists eternally without any beginning or end and without any limitations whatsoever. The 'thing' that exists within this world has two forms, namely **matter** and **energy**. This matter is incessantly running about There is never any respite or stability for its movement. Involution, evolution, manifestation and unmanifestation — thus the inherent nature of matter is ever changing In the unlimited space there are innumerable stars; among them some are slowly getting destroyed, and some others are born anew and are shining. Our sun is one among such stars. After many crores of years, as a result of some unseen or unknown cause some parts called planets got severed from this sun; but even today they are revolving round the sun, having been influenced by the sun's gravitational force. Our earth is one among such planets which are revolving round the sun. This earth was in the beginning a very hot mass of gas and cooling off for a long time it got solidified and finally on it water settled down. After millions of years on that

Rarest Archive

earth many creatures appeared and among them the vertebrate class of creatures stole a march over the others; from these recently the class of creatures, called the mammals, were produced. And one of the branches of the highest species among these mammals is, in fact, the human being (Homo Sapiens). He is born out of the ape belonging to the same species. If we acknowledge the queer details of astronomy and geography which we have described in brief so far, no one will have the courage to voice with pride the greatness of man. Who knows how many stars there are in the entire endless space and among them around which stars other planets are revolving just as in our solar system, and how many such systems there are ! If our earth, which belongs to one among the innumerable star systems, is compared to the whole universe, then would it even be of the size of a particle in a pencil of ray or not ! Then to which particle of a thing should man, who is born just recently in some corner of such an earth and is just opening his eyes, as it were, be compared ? And the statement that — ''Among these millions of men if some one who has just now opened his eyes', as it were, discriminates on his three states of Consciousness, he will be able to grasp the Ultimate Reality behind this universe'' - will be analogous to the story that a jackal, which was being washed away in the current of a river, shouted out that if it is lost the whole universe would be destroyed. What else can it be ? — This alone is the opinion of the opponent.

In finding out an answer to this objection, it becomes necessary to bring to our mind the distinction between the

Rarest Archive

viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness and the viewpoint of the empirical sciences. This we have already (subsections 17, 23) mentioned. The viewpoint of the empirical or physical sciences is the external or objective view of the predominant waking state. This viewpoint takes into the reckoning only the objects appearing in the waking and having given predominance to the external world, it presumes beforehand that we exist in one corner of that world. But if properly examined, what is this phenomenon called 'world'? It is true that in it there exist innumerable stars, planets and meteors; but apart from the fact that this world comprising this our sun, moon, stars etc. is 'a mere flash of an object' in the Consciousness, what else is it? Is it ever possible even to surmise the existence of this unfathomable universe in any other manner than through this Consciousness? If observed from this viewpoint, does this world, which appears never to be measureable, seem to be greater or does the Consciousness, which has objectified all this universe and has kept it in its grasp, seem to be greater? To the question — 'Is the object, i.e. this universe, greater or is the subject, i.e the Consciousness, which has objectified all this, greater'? — to give an answer, no one takes time. To any one it immediately strikes that this very Consciousness, which is capable of objectifying even the smallest thing without any effort and which can objectify with the same effortlessness this entire external universe itself, is, in fact, having greater existence. Although man's inquiry into the astronomical and geographical spheres as also the diversities in them is immensely beneficial to the particularized knowledge needed in day-to day life, there is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that **the inquiry into this Consciousness**, which takes into consideration the entire universe and knows it,

Rarest Archives

is more beneficial for **the knowledge of the Immutable (indivisible) Ultimate Reality.** If we discard that Consciousness, which is the substratum of the world's existence and without which the entire universe becomes just like a mere dance of darkness before blind people, how at all can we know the essence of the universe ? As the essential nature of Consciousness in Itself is being discussed and inquired into in detail in due course, here this topic can be concluded. For the time being, it is enough if it is remembered that: Howsoever the universe may be extensive, howsoever it may be diverse and wonderful, all its essence is inherent in the objective sphere of our Consciousness. As this universe appears only within our waking state (sub-section 27), if we inquire into the waking, it amounts to our inquiring into the universe also which exists within it. It is true that by this method the inner details of the diverse objects appearing in the world cannot be known; but for our purpose of fathoming the **Ultimate Reality of everything** those details are not necessary. There is no cause whatsoever for imagining that the knowledge obtained by inquiring into the complete state is queerer or less useful than the knowledge that inquires into one part within that state.

33. What is the defect in the waking viewpoint ?

Now another objection has to be taken for detailed consideration. Up to now it has been accepted that because the empirical sciences and other schools of philosophy have adopted the waking viewpoint they have defects, whereas because Vedantins carry on their discrimination taking into account all the three states theirs is the comprehensive

Rarest Archive

viewpoint. But what is the defect in the waking viewpoint ? All phenomena like our birth, growth and accumulation of our knowledge etc. take place in the waking alone. The happiness and grief that we get have value in the waking alone. For, as the happiness that we get in the waking is known, with certainty, to have been obtained from such and such a thing, it is but natural for us to have the desire to get that happiness once again; the dealing of making an effort to procure such a thing of happiness also becomes a reasonable one. Similarly, the grief that we suffer in the waking can be traced to its cause by means of anticipation and experiment; we can also make efforts to remove the cause for that grief. But is it possible in our dream, which varies daily and comes and goes, to find out the cause for the happiness and grief that are obtained therein and, just as in the waking, is it possible to undertake in the dream some determined action ? Never it is possible. In deep sleep, especially, there is no room for anticipation even to find out anew anything whatsoever which is beneficial to carrying out any transaction For this reason, does it not become the duty of everyone of us to discriminate on the subject of the waking state alone ? Another point : In the waking the world that is seen by us and the things that are in it are common to all and are controlled by known rules and regulations. Today's world alone will exist tomorrow also. Today's regulations pertaining to the nature of things will themselves continue to hold good tomorrow also. In this manner, because all of us have a deep-rooted belief based on the experience gained here (in the waking), there is a possibility of either help or danger being caused among one another. For this reason alone, the scientists, who are wise, capable and service-minded, discover every now and then the different

Rarest Archive

natures and behaviours of things in this regulated world and are formulating various scientific treatises which are beneficial to humanity. In this world of the waking there is a possibility for selfish people to wish to cause harm to others and to pursue the path of their heinous design as also for holy persons to find out ways of bringing prosperity and happiness to the whole world But where is such a possibility in the dream ? Dreams are states which are experienced separately by individuals. There it is not possible to determine as to what happens at what time. It being so, where is the question of doing good or bad to one another in the dream ? This is one reason to say that the viewpoint of giving greater importance to the waking is infallible or blemishless. Another point to drive home the idea of the greatness of this viewpoint may also be mentioned here. In the scriptural texts knowledge regarding religious duties through injunctions of the nature of do's and don'ts and things opposed to them (*Dharma* and *Adharma*) rebirth or reincarnation (*Janmaantara*), transmigration to celestial worlds (*Lokaantara*) etc. are taught and reverence towards the attainment of greater enlightenment has been created in man; now at least for the sake of fulfilment of that purpose of the scriptural texts what other alternative (sphere of activity) is there apart from the waking state ? Either the scriptural texts or the religious guide (Guru) is to be got in the waking alone. Where else can we get them ? If not in the waking where else can we experience the bad effects of our vicious acts or the good effects of our meritorious deeds ? Even the ultimate goal of life that all aspirants for Emancipation wish to attain is obtained on the basis of the teachings in the waking by our Guru or spiritual guide and on the strength of the disciplines or spiritual

Rarest Archive

practices undertaken by us in our waking in accordance with his teachings, is it not ?

If seen in this light, just as in the case of empirical transactions, in the same way in the case of scriptural transactions also the waking viewpoint is extremely essential; there is no doubt whatsoever about this fact. Let alone all this. Even for the protagonists of the three states of Consciousness, is it possible to discard the waking viewpoint ? No. For, either for teaching the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality to others or for showing the benefits of the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality to people in the empirical sphere they also have to surrender themselves to the waking viewpoint alone. Otherwise, if they give up the waking viewpoint, with what other viewpoint can they see all of us ? From what viewpoint can we also listen to their teachings ? From whatever viewpoint if it is seen, one has to accept that the waking viewpont is infallible, beneficial and inevitable. The opinion that there is a defect in the waking viewpoint seems to be the mesmerizing powder that some protagonists throw on the people and further this seems to be one big hindrance to the great benefits accruing to people from physical sciences, moral and devotional treatises. The statement that they carry on their discrimination by giving up the waking viewpoint and from another viewpoint, called 'the viewpoint of the three states', seems to be a magical tree alone that some new protagonists have invented, and, in truth, no result whatsoever can be obtained from it. Therefore, as no system of argument can ever discard the waking viewpoint, it becomes established that the examination of the three states is not at all an extra-ordinary method of teaching the Ultimate Reality.

Rarest Archive

We have stated above arguments in favour of the waking viewpoint as strongly as it is possible. As the waking viewpoint alone has been clung on to very stubbornly either by the common people or the scientists who reason out without having trodden the path of the three states and as this waking viewpoint alone is a strong hurdle in determining the Ultimate Reality, it becomes highly necessary for those who wish to discriminate about the Reality to examine very carefully the strong and weak points in this viewpoint. It has been argued out in the above objections that all people have to perforce carry out the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality in the waking state alone and further the benefit that accrues from that also has to be attained in the waking state alone, is it not? This is true, indeed, because the fact that 'the lack of knowledge of the Reality also has occurred in the waking alone, so Its knowledge also has to be gained in the waking alone, is to be accepted. But based on which viewpoint is the discrimination to be carried out? Should we discriminate on the basis of the viewpoint that we are confined only to the waking state or on the basis of the viewpoint that we are of a nature transcending the waking state? This is the crux of the problem now It is true that we have the waking state; but is it not true also that similarly we have the dream state as also the deep sleep state? Hence, if we discriminate by referring to our experience, we are not confined to waking, dream or deep sleep states. In fact, these three states are adventitious to us and they leave us also. It being so, if we discriminate by taking predominant identification beforehand with any one of these three states, how at all can the Ultimate Reality be known as It is? It is true that we attach value to the happiness and grief as also to the help and harm that

Rarest Archive

accrúe to us in the waking alone; but how does this fact affect the Ultimate Reality at all ? If it is to be determined that what we desire — that alone should be the Reality, then in that case what is determined on the basis of the waking viewpoint alone might be taken as the Ultimate Reality. But there is no question whatsoever of taking into account what is desirable to us or what is undesirable to us as far as the Ultimate Reality is concerned. That which exists as it is in the ultimate analysis, that alone is a thing's reality. For example, many people do not desire poverty, while the rich people aspire to be happy alone. But what is the real state of affairs ? Many people are poor only; and in this respect, this alone is the reality. Because of the fact that we do not desire poverty, the fact that many of us are truly poor alone is not rendered 'as not the reality' or false. Similarly, in the present context too in the day-to-day transactions we may be attaching greater value to the happiness and grief that occur in the waking; but from that fact alone it cannot be said or established that the waking viewpoint is enough for the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality. The opponent has contended that the waking world exists eternally as it is, and as the objects or things in that world are subjected to the regulations of time, space and causation, we can attempt to obtain happiness or benefit that can be got from those things as also endeavour to get rid of any grief or disadvantage that may result from those things, while the dream world or the things which appear therein have no such value at all, is it not ? We must keep in mind, at the outset, the fact that this opinion has arisen because of the strong or innate identification or affinity with the waking viewpoint. For, just as when we are in the waking state we have the strong identification with the waking world alone as having value,

Rarest Archives

during the dream state also we have invariably such an identification with the dream world. Then (in the dream) we do not ever discard that in the manner-- "This is a mere dream !" Evenour notions that 'the dream appears differently at different moments and that there is no stuff whatsoever in the things that appear in those different dreams' are also formed from the waking viewpoint; when we are perceiving those objects within the dream, during the experience of the dream we do not feel it or experience it to be so, i.e. we do not experience them to be unreal or without any stuff. Further, the opponent has stated that — "Because in the waking world many people who exist just like us and they attach value to the waking world (and the things in it) while the dream and the deep sleep states are our individual states, it is not proper to give these latter two states the same higher status as that of the waking state" — is it not ? To this, we can give two kinds of answers : Let us take the stand that it is true that the waking world is common to people. while the dream and the deep sleep states are not like that; from this mere fact how can the waking deserve the higher status ? Can it be said that what is accepted by many people alone is the Ultimate Reality ? Never can it be said so. For that reason, even if it is taken that the waking is a common state to all, it cannot attain any higher value whatsoever. But if things are observed as they are, i.e. in their proper perspective, the waking state also is our individual state of experience alone, just like the dream and the deep sleep states, and not the total experience of many people at all. Just as 'we alone sleep and we alone witness the dream', we experience that 'we alone are getting awake'. **Just as we cannot directly know or experience others having sleeping or dreaming experiences, similarly we cannot also experience**

Rarest Archives

directly others having the waking experience. The statement we make to the effect that others are sleeping is also based on the surmise that we make in our waking; even our notions or conceptions that we form to the effect that 'they have had dreams' and 'they are awake are based on the dealings or transactions that they have with us in our waking. Thus by the examination of the waking, dream and deep sleep states of others alone (objectively) the determination of the Ultimate Reality, which has to be attained by each one of us (subjectively) on the strength of comprehensive (i.e. Intuitive) experience, can never be achieved; because, then it will amount to the fact that we have relied upon the waking experience and rejected our deep sleep and dream experiences without examining them It being so, the waking viewpoint is incomplete or inadequate; it can never be established that the determination of the Ultimate Reality based on the waking viewpoint is infallible and inviolable. For all these reasons, although both the Vedantins and the other philosophers have to determine the Ultimate Reality in the waking alone, all the others have taken the waking state experience alone as important and are looking upon the remaining two states as a tail or appendage tagged on to it, just as a tail tagged on to a kite; but Vedantins, on the other hand, have ventured to determine the Ultimate Reality on the dispassionate or unbiased outlook of the three states. In this **respect, the methodology adopted by Vedantins can be said unobjectionably to be unparalleled.**

34. We should first take it hypothetically that the Ultimate Reality exists :

What proof is there to say that the Ultimate Reality exists? This whole gamut of discrimination has been started

Rarest Archives

on the premise that there is a certain immutable or changeless Ultimate Reality as the substratum for all appearances manifesting in the forms of existence, knowledge and happiness etc. in this world and further that Reality alone is appearing as all these forms, is it not? But, first and foremost, how can it be said that the manifested forms in the world exist independently as different things and that they are entities existing in and by themselves without having any cause? *If this world is scrutinized carefully*, not a thing in it appears to remain as it is. All things are invariably changing from moment to moment. Even inanimate or insentient things like stone, sand etc. are also ever changing only The sentient or animate creatures too are having invariably and inevitably changes like manifestation, growth, change, decay, death etc. When seen in this light, it can be said that everything is a flow or flux of change alone. Especially within ourselves, change and movement are continuously manifesting themselves. Similarly, *if it* is observed with full alertness or awareness, this movement or flux is undivided or unbroken, continuous; even the statement that 'we are changing entities' is made on the hypothesis of taking it to be true that 'there exist some objects and they are changing' But is there a thing which is not included in the flow of change? The manifestations of internal knowledge or experience and the external existence are all the flow of change alone. Just as in a constantly flowing river we conceive different things like water, whirlpool and cross currents etc., we conceive in this universe, which is a flow of activity or motion, different parts as objects or entities If it is witnessed properly, what is called 'knowledge or experience' is this change alone, what are called 'states are also this change alone;

Rarest Archives

when everything is a flow of motion and change, where is the question of the Ultimate Reality which is immutable or steadfast and changeless ?

If an answer to this objection is to be given, that would be possible only after the readers go through the whole book. Even so, we will give here in a concise form a kind of an answer. How is it possible to proceed further without giving a general solution to this objection which is like an axe to the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality ? **It is not possible for the philosophical texts to advance even a single step without taking it hypothetically that there is an Ultimate Reality.** But this difficulty is not there only for the philosophical science but for all sciences also. For example, the science of energy starts only on the assumption that there is an energy in the world; astronomy has assumed that the stars, planets etc. really exist; the science of geography has hypothetically taken it that its subject-matter of a world exists only Anyone can question that: "It is natural for the physical sciences to take hypothetically their respective subject-matters to exist because that part of the world which is an object to the senses is their subject-matter (or the object of study); but because the entity called 'the Ultimate Reality' is supra-sensory, how is it possible to take it hypothetically to exist ?" But to any science there is no scope whatsoever to carry out the study or discrimination without assuming or hypothetically taking that there is a particular object and that that object has **an essential reality or** *esse*. The science of physics has started to find out the essential nature of physical objects or things; but even before finding it out how did it, i.e. the science of physics, assume that the things have

Rarest Archive

an essential nature ?— If this question is posed, what answer can there be ? Similarly, every science has started on the assumption that it has an entity (with its essential nature of existence or being) to explore only; that particular branch of science invariably carries on its deliberations till it comes to the hard, infallible conclusion that its entity or object with an essential nature of existence does not exist at all. If all sciences have started on the assumption that their respective objects of study undoubtedly exist, then why should not the philosophical science also — which has started its inquiry on the question — **"Is there an Ultimate Reality or Truth which is the essence of all these entities (of the physical or empirical sciences)?"** — take it hypothetically that its subject-matter, viz. Ultimate Truth or Reality, exists ?! The thinkers and philosophers of all countries and of all periods have invariably carried out their inquiry by assuming or taking it hypothetically that 'there is truly an Entity which is the substratum for the world'; apart from the fact whether their efforts have been successful or not, it can be said that for the veracity of the existence of an Ultimate Reality the universal and innate belief that exists thus in man is itself an evidence or proof. Besides, it is also not possible to say that so far the thinkers and philosophers have not at all found out anything or that there is not a bit of agreement among them at all. If the history of the philosophies is scrutinized, it can be said that so far many things have been established to be true on the majority verdict. Why go that far ? Even the opponent who has started to say that there is no single Ultimate Reality, has done so by assuming that he has to present his opinion to the proponent of the Ultimate Reality only, as also that it is possible for him to present his contentions. Is it not ? In that case, does it not amount to saying that the opponent

Rarest Archives

himself has assumed that there is a method of discrimination acceptable to both the opponent and the proponent, as also that as this method is in a fully established or orderly manner common to both, it can be shown by logical argument or dialectics ? Anyway, the fact — The assumption or hypothesis of taking that there must be an Ultimate Reality to be the essence of this world cannot at all be impertinent'— is established.

35. The states are not of the nature of change, but they are states in the real sense of the term :

But to the question — 'Is there an Ultimate Reality which is constant and changeless ?'— the above answer is not enough or satisfactory. Therefore, it becomes necessary for us to examine the objection : 'As all that is appearing before us is of the nature of change only, which is that Reality that is constant as well as changeless ?' In one sense all the people will have to accept the fact that whatever 'thing' that there is in the world does not exist even for a moment without change. Therefore, what we talk about in the manner — "Things were in that state at that time, but now they are in this state"— is nothing but the empirical dealing which is conceptual as well as relative, but the notion that 'the things have really different states' is not true. Even while we were saying — "Such and such a thing was in this condition at such and such a time"— that particular thing or object was in the form of change alone. We only conceived in our mind, for the time being, that it was one entity by separating it from the flow of change. Even when we said — "That thing was like that" — it was

Rarest Archive

not existing as it was (previously); it does not exist separately without being related to another; just as when it is stated — "The water on this side of the river is flowing faster than the water on the other side" — all the water is one flow of water alone and water which is separate from the flow does not exist at all, similarly all has become one flow of change alone. Just as people conceive different parts called 'notes of sound' while elaborating a tune or *Raaga* in music, similarly our intellect conceives' different parts in the whole universe; even so, there is no proof to establish that there are those parts in reality in it, i.e. the universe — We cannot confront people who argue out on such lines (In India the idealist Buddhist schools of '*Kshanika Vijnaanavaadins*' and Bergson, among the Western thinkers, etc. have upheld the contention or argument that everything is of the natura or form of change alone).

Even so, the states of waking dream and deep sleep, which we have taken up for discrimination, cannot be said to belong, in this manner, to a form of flow. When a person who is awake gets sleep, can it be said that his waking state itself became deep sleep ? In the waking a second thing appears, while in deep sleep nothing whatsoever is seen; neither any one can possibly say that these states which are extremely of opposite natures are conjoined to one another, nor that one state proceeds (or flows forth) like the water in a river and becomes another state. In the waking state there is time, while in deep sleep it is not there at all; when it is so, it is not at all possible to imagine that the waking flowed on and then finally got converted into deep sleep and that at any one moment (of time) deep sleep became converted into waking Unless

Rarest Archive

one goes to sleep dream does not occur; even when it seems to us that the person who is awake sees the dream in an instant, all of us surmise that in between deep sleep occurs and only when the waking is totally shattered or cut asunder the dream appears. Apart from this, when the dream is over and waking takes place, one state 'invariably comes' after the other 'has gone away or out of existence without leaving even a little bit of interval or interstice in between'. Therefore, it should be accepted that all the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep are 'real states' ; it should also be accepted that their appearances are independent, without having even a little of relationship with one another ; it should also be accepted that these three states are not imaginary parts belonging to any one flow or series of time. Had these states been the parts of any one thing, all of them would have had to appear on the substrate or base of one series of time ; but the real state of affairs is not like this. The time that is there in the waking vanishes into thin air so to speak, in deep sleep; in the dream there is another series of time which is of the appearance of an extremely queer nature (*Sutra Bhashya* 3-2-3). Therefore, it is contradictory to everyone's experience to reckon that these states, which do not have a common series of time whatsoever, belong to one and only one flow or flux of change. Anyway, there are real states of experience; hence, it does not amount to any contradiction or opposition whatsoever to the acceptance of the axiom or hypothetical assumption of 'the existence of a changeless Ultimate Reality'. The assumption that — "Everything is change alone, there are no states of experience at all"— is opposed to or contradictory to everyone's experience.

Rarest Archive

36. It is possible to divine or intuit the Ultimate Reality :

Let us now take up for consideration another objection. Let us accept that in the 'visible objective totality' there are the three states of experience and that everything is not a mere flow of change. But is it possible to divine or find out the essential nature or truth of these states ? To know whether the objective totality appearing to us in these states 'exists as it appears' or whether 'behind it (i.e. the visible objective totality)' there is 'another entity or Reality which is its essence,' what means or evidence have we got ? Is it proper to believe that by the mere consideration of the three states we will find out or acquire the essential nature of those states ? Apart from this, while we are getting the knowledge of the states themselves or of the objects or things which appear within the states, even that knowledge also is continuously or constantly changing only. In fact, the knowledge of each one of the states is of a different kind; the knowledge of each object visible is also of a different kind. Thus when the knowledge and the known — both these are constantly changing, what could be the changeless or steadfast, immutable entity ?

Although this objection seems to be very strong on its face, there is no threat to the veracity of the method of the three states. For, when we perceive the external world visible within the states through our senses, there may arise a doubt to the effect — ''Does this world exist as it appears to us alone or is there another essential nature behind it ?' Because, as we get the 'mediate knowledge' of the world through the medium of the senses, if those

Rarest Archive

adjuncts of the senses are not there, there is scope or room for a doubt like — "How does that world exist?" — to arise. But there is no cause for such a doubt to arise as regards the states; for, the states are **directly or Intuitively experienced** by us only (i.e. not through any other medium like the senses or the mind). We have the means called **"Anubhava" or Intuition** to cognize the states and to know them; to aggregate and assimilate the various decisions or conclusions drawn from that Intuition and to determine **the Truth or Reality** we have reasoning or discrimination, called *Yukti*. When it is so, does it not amount to a statement of arrogance or insolence if it is said that there is no means to determine the Ultimate Reality ? Everybody has to accept that the knowledges of the states and of the visible objects within them are of different kinds. But that 'the defference is true' can be established only when it is accepted that **there must be some one entity to witness the changes in the knowledges**, is it not ? It will have to be accepted that we who are witnessing and knowing Intuitively the coming and going of the knowledges of the states — in that our essential nature of Intuition there is no change whatsoever; it will also have to be accepted that in that essential nature of Intuition of ours **there is knowledge which is inherent in, or innate to, its very essence**, just as heat is inherent in fire. Therefore, though the states as well as the knowledges of the states are coming and going, everyone will have to perforce accept that we have an essential nature of Intuition (as the core of our Being) which knows them directly or Intuitively without itself undergoing any change whatsoever. **There is no objection whatsoever to the philosophical teaching that with the help of this Intuitive knowledge**

Rarest Archive

of our changeless core of Being we can determine the essential nature of everything.

37. If the three states are considered, it amounts to considering everything :

There is an objection like — "By mere consideration of or discrimination about our three states, can it ever be said to be tantamount to the consideration of the Ultimate Reality (which is the very essence) of the entire universe?" This objection arises in only such people who have forgotten or failed to reckon the comprehensive meaning of the word — "*Avastha*" or a state of experience Earlier (sub-section 26) we have already explained how much is the pervasive nature of the word — "*Avastha*" or a state. If the readers keep that in mind, then the threat of this objection will not affect them. The differences or distinctions of — 'our waking', 'their waking' — are born out of the intellectual defect of not having understood the meaning of the word, 'waking'. Things or objects like 'I', 'you', 'they', 'other objects' appear in our waking alone. Therefore, all of them are included or assimilated in the waking alone. The belief or notion that 'many people in the world are first awake and then they go to sleep' is born in us in our waking. **Therefore, after our waking is taken up for discrimination or consideration in its entirety there does not remain any more to be considered, either the people who exist outside or apart from that waking or their waking, dream and deep sleep states.** Hence, if the meanings of the words like waking, dream and deep sleep are properly understood as the waking, dream and deep sleep states of mine, i.e. of the aspirant (who wishes to know the Ultimate Reality),

Rarest Archives

then there does not remain behind anything whatsoever that is not included in the discrimination about the three states; if the Ultimate Reality behind the three states (i.e. existing as their very essence of Being) is found out (i.e. Intuited), then there does not remain anything else to be known at all (*Maandukya Kaarika Bhashya* – 4-88) and this fact is unassailable or cannot ever be invalidated.

38 The philosophical teaching or theory of the three states is unassailable :

There remains yet another objection like : "What guarantee is there to say or assert that the philosophical teaching or theory which has been now formulated on the basis of the discrimination about the three states is itself the final or ultimate conclusion ?" Many philosophical teachings or theories have so far been formulated in the world and have vanished also, and it cannot be surmised as to how many more will be born in the future Even if it is taken for granted that all the schools of philosophy, which existed before the Vedanta philosophy came into being, have been refuted by it (i.e. Vedanta philosophy), there is neither any reason to believe that the ancient philosophers (of the Vedantic school) had anticipated the numerous philosophical systems which are born recently, nor that they (ancient Vedantic philosophers) had already accumulated or compiled stronger arguments or logical means than those adopted by all these new systems. Even in the event of accepting such a situation, who can ever say that at least in the future a philosophical system which can set aside the logical means adopted by this Vedantic philosophical system by means of more powerful logical

Rarest Archive

arguments cannot come into being? Who will ever take the blame or responsibility of making a categorical statement that a philosophical system which has adopted subtler logical arguments than Vedanta will never in the eternal time come into being?— This is the real intention of those who make this kind of an objection.

To those who have examined the system of the formulation of the methodology of the three states the fact that 'this above objection is without any support' should inevitably flash or strike itself. For, to say definitely that — 'the objects which are born in a moment of time and which then disappear or vanish are only so many or they are only such and such things' — is not possible for anyone, and this is true. Therefore, it is but natural to think that if any one person in a certain period of time founds a philosophical system with the help of his sharp intellect, any other person with a sharper intellect may be able to formulate or expound a more powerful or profound philosophy which will prove the former to be inferior. But if any one has found out on the strength of Intuition a certain Reality which is not bound by the rules or regulations of time (i.e. extra-temporal Reality of the essential nature of Intuitive experience, or Pure Consciousness), then how at all can any dialectic or logical device, howevermuch powerful it may be, of any period of time shake it or refute it? **Vedanta is not a philosophical system like any other built upon a mere dialectical or logical system.** The states of waking, dream and deep sleep which are the objects of discrimination for it, i.e. Vedanta, are not restricted by or confined to any time category; on the other hand, the category of time itself is a particular or distinct appearance or phenomenon confined

Rarest Archive

within the waking as well as the dream. Especially regarding the essential nature of Pure Consciousness or Intuition of the Witness who 'sees' these states as external objects, there is no possibility whatsoever of It being restricted by any category of time. It being so, where is any scope for the doubt that the subject-matter of Vedanta (i.e. Pure Consciousness or Intuitive experience), which has transcended the region or realm itself of time, may be falsified or invalidated in due course of time ? **If it is determined or established that there is no entity to be considered other than the one determined through the method of the three states, and if it is fully established that this discrimination about the three states is carried out systematically, then the possibility of the philosophical teaching that we formulate getting falsified or refuted at any time will not be there at all.** Any one can raise a doubt : As there are states like intoxication and swooning or fainting also, other than the three states (i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep), if those states are not taken into consideration, then will not the method followed by us amount to incomplete or partial view ? But the fact that states are three alone will in due course (subsection 40) be established without giving any room for any counter argument. Therefore, there is no defect whatsoever in this methodology. We can now begin without any bother the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality following this viewpoint of the three states of Consciousness.

Rarest Archive

(E) An Outline Of The Method Of The Three States

38. What is meant by 'Avastha' or a state ?

The essential nature of the viewpoint of the three states, its greatness or importance as well as its comprehensiveness have been hitherto denoted. Now, we will mention briefly the methodology formulated by Vedantins following this viewpoint. First of all, one should understand or discern the philosophical teachings or theory that has been made out in this methodology regarding the essential nature of a state or *'Avastha'*. If any one is asked—"What is meant by a state ?" — he gives the answer — "Condition". But by this brief answer alone the essential nature of a state or *Avastha* is not revealed. In the word — *'Avastha'*, the prefix *'Ava'* as well as the root *'Stha'*, i.e. 'stay put' are conjoined. Whatever be an object or a thing, we commonly think that before it stops or stays put it must either be changing or moving. For instance, a mango; a tender fruit becomes an unripe fruit and then ripens, is it not ? Here the tender fruit is small, the unripe fruit is big and the ripe fruit is first big, then after some time, dries up and once again becomes small. These are the various changes that take place in the size of the mango fruit. When the mango is tender it gives an astringent taste to the tongue; when it is unripe fruit it gives a sour taste and when it is ripe it tastes sweet ; these are the changes in its taste. In the same manner, in the case of its colour, smell and touch also there are different qualities or features seen in the tender, unripe and ripe fruits, is it not ? Thus as the thing called mango undergoes different changes and remains in different forms of tender, unripe and ripe fruits

Rarest Archive

for brief periods, to call these three forms as the *'Avastha'* or state or *'Sthithi'* or condition is customary. This is one meaning of the word, *'Avastha'*. This word is being used with another meaning also. For instance, if a mango fruit which was on the branch of a tree, for some reason or other, gets dislodged from its foot-stalk and falls down and on its way down if it stops between two off-shoots of a branch or if it falls on the ground and stops there only, this stopping is called its one *'Avastha'* only. In that context, by *'Avastha'* it is meant 'that which was moving has stopped'. Just as it is assumed that a mango fruit has changed its state from the tender fruit to the unripe fruit and from the unripe fruit to the ripe fruit, people think that after the fruit from above fell down it reached from a moving condition to a stationary condition. Thus in day-to-day transactions there are two meanings for the word *'Avastha'*. When we speak of the waking, the dream and the deep sleep as *'Avasthas'*, should we take any one of these two meanings or should we adopt a third meaning ? This is the question now.

When we are having waking, dream and deep sleep, just as the tender fruit becomes unripe fruit or the unripe fruit becomes ripe fruit, in us there is no change whatsoever, having been subject to the flux of time. Because, after the tender fruit becomes an unripe fruit — that very unripe fruit turning back to its original form of tender fruit — we have never seen. But as regards the *'Avasthas'*, which we are speaking about, it is not so. We, who have gone from the waking to deep sleep or dream, return again to the waking easily; not only that, we are invariably having the three *Avasthas* repeatedly. Just as when the

Rarest Archive

tender fruit becomes the unripe fruit the former changes the size, the taste, the smell and the colour that are there in it and begets a different form, we do not change our body, mind and senses etc. which are seen in the waking into the body, mind and senses etc. of the dream. We leave the waking body etc. along with the waking itself and get the dream. Besides, just as when the tender fruit changes into unripe fruit, to the former a new colour and a new smell etc. have really and adventitiously attached themselves, at the time of our dream our dream body etc. do not really attach themselves to us adventitiously. As soon as we are awake, they (i.e. the dream body, mind etc.) leave us and vanish. Therefore, to say that waking and dream are changes that occur to us being subject to the flux of time, there is no support of any experience whatsoever. In the same manner, our getting waking and dream cannot be said to be an *'Avastha'* of the kind of a stationary condition reached after moving from one place to another. For, when an object moves from one place to another, there must be à common substratum which joins those two places. For example, when a football rolls from one place to another and stops, the ground is the support or substratum which joins those two spots; when birds are flying in the sky from one place to another, to both those spots the sky and the wind are the supports. In this manner, it is not possible at all for us to think that we leave the waking and go to the dream and stop there seeking a particular support. For, we cannot find in our experience any support whatsoever common to the waking and the dream. Apart from this, just as we go from one town to another either by the means like walking or a vehicle etc. we do not go from waking to dream using any means of transport whatsoever. Just as we calculate and measure the distance

Rarest Archive

between one town and another to be so many miles and the duration of travel to be of so many hours or days, it is not possible for us to measure the interval between the waking and the dream in terms of either distance or time. In addition to this, just as two towns which are existing in one flux of time alone and on one ground only, no one among us think that the two states of waking and dream exist on any one support or substratum of common flux of time or common space. For all these reasons, it is not possible for us to assume that waking and dream are either the forms of change occurring to us being subject to the same flux of time or the particular stationary positions obtained after going from one place to another. If it is so, what is our opinion when we call waking and dream as '*Avasthas*' ?

The Vedantin's answer to this question is : When we say that the examination of the three states or *Avasthas* alone is the proper way to determine the Ultimate Reality, **the word 'Avastha' means it is the way or manner in which the Ultimate Reality appears.** That which exists always exists, that which does not exist does never exist' — is a self-established axiom. There is never any destruction to the Ultimate Reality. When seen from different viewpoints It appears differently; but in whatever manner It appears It abides or subsists as the Ultimate Reality alone. It does not beget any increase or decrease in Its essential nature. Even so, It may appear differently owing to the difference in our viewpoint. In as many ways It may appear to us, in so many ways each one of them is called Its various '*Avastha*' or state. By one example this opinion can be elucidated. Suppose a person has five rupees. He can use it in the form of a five-rupee currency note, or five one-rupee coins, or ten 50-paise coins, or twenty 25-paise coins

Rarest Archive

or 50 ten-paise coins or 100 five-paise coins, is it not? Here, although the money that is with him first assumes the form of the currency note and then the various forms of the metal coins and though in number it assumes increasing numbers from one to 100, as regards its value no one thinks that it has either increased or decreased. Similarly, the Ultimate Reality is appearing to us in the three forms of waking, dream and deep sleep. It has 'spread out in the waking in one manner and becomes an object to our Intuition or Pure Consciousness, and It appears as an object in a different manner in the dream. Thus in as many different ways the Ultimate Reality may appear to us, in so many ways each one of them is called Its *'Avastha'*.

40 Avasthas or states are three only :

Now let us consider the question : How many states are there ? This is a very important question for Vedantic ratiocination. For, in the statement that if the three states are taken up for consideration, it amounts to considering the Ultimate Reality alone, the opinion that the states are three only is implicit. But if the states are more than three and we consider only three states, then the conclusion that we have drawn can never become the final verdict; it will also not be one arrived at from a comprehensive or plenary viewpoint. From the common viewpoint it appears that, apart from waking, dream and deep sleep, there are still some more states, indeed For example, so many times people desire or yearn in their minds in the form — "It has to be done that way; it has to be done this way", is it not ? This is a state called *'Manoratha'* or mind's wish or wishful thinking. Knowingly or unknowingly, people

Rarest Archive

consume intoxicating things, get inebriated and become unconscious. This is called *'Mada'* or a state of intoxication. As a result of some cause the power of the intellect may be deluded and people may be uttering nonsensical things; this state is called *'Unmada'* or state of insanity. As a result of some injury to the body or because of disease, or as a result of psychological effects from fear, anxiety etc. one may lose his consciousness and faint; this state is called *'Moorcha'* or swoon; from causes like high fever from cold etc. one may visualize many things and get agitated; this state is called *'Sunnypaatha'* or delirium. Some people have a kind of a state after they go to sleep. Then they wander about and speak like people who are awake only, and though they are carrying out such transactions, after becoming really awake they do not remember even an iota of the transactions that they carried out in that state. This kind of state is called *'Nidravihaaraavastha'* or somnambulism. Some others are enveloped by delusion; then they do not carry on any transaction full of activity, like people in their waking, nor are they completely inactive like people who are asleep; this state may be called *'Tooshneemaavastha'* or coma or stupor. Some people have called that state of a person when he has got up from sleep but not yet properly acquired the waking consciousness or the state of half consciousness before getting sleep also as *'Tooshneemaavastha'*. In order to indicate the difference between this state and the one in which by nature it is always enveloped by delusion, the latter deluded state can be called *'Jadaavastha'* or unconscious state. As a result of special acts or powers going under the names of magic, exercising or witchcraft, and mesmerism, some people lose half consciousness and then they do not experience any pain from the prick of a needle or the touch of fire, it is

Rarest Archive

said. People in that state, as a result of the mesmeric or hypnotic spell, even mention about things as they are, although they are not even acquainted with those things earlier. This state may be called *'Vashyaavastha'* or mesmeric or hypnotic state. Further the fact that 'Yogis remain in the *'Samaadhi Avastha'* or trance without any consciousness of the outside world at all, is very popular in our country (India) for a long time. After the expiry of one's span of life that state of dying called *'Maranaavastha'* or death, and the state attained by a person after he is liberated or emancipated from the clutches of *'Samsaara'* or mundane existence, as mentioned in the religious or scriptural texts, called *'Muktaavastha'* or Liberation or Emancipation — these also can be taken into the reckoning here. None of the states that we have mentioned so far appear alike. Is it not necessary then to examine all these states for the determination of the Ultimate Reality ? To say that only the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep should be considered, what are those exclusive special features in them ? We must necessarily answer this question first. Anyone can give a kind of an answer to this. For example, waking, dream and deep sleep are the common states experienced by the human beings in general; but the other states are not like that; they are experienced by some people on certain occasions. Therefore, it can be said that they need not be considered at all But it cannot be said that this answer is satisfactory. For, it is not possible to discard any experience while determining the Ultimate Reality. If it is to be deservingly called the comprehensive or totality of experience (of all human beings) whether they are common experiences or exclusive or special experiences — all of them must be taken up for examination or scrutiny. Is it not ?

Rarest Archive

To this the Vedantin's answer is: We might have perceived in our waking certain people experiencing an intoxicated state, insanity, delirium or the remaining states. But what of it? They are not the states that we have to consider here. We have now taken up for consideration only the fact as to in how many different ways is the Ultimate Reality appearing to our Consciousness. In the previous section we have indicated that these various ways (in which the Reality appears) alone are called by us as '*Avastha*' or a state. If viewed from this perspective, all the states are subsumed by the one state called 'waking'. It being so, how can those other states become different or separate states? This difficulty in the manner of reasoning itself has arisen indeed because of having forgotten the facts that all that appears in our waking belongs to the waking alone and is also confined to the waking alone (sub-section 27) and not from any other cause.

But anybody may think that there is another viewpoint from which these three states can be considered. For instance, it does not matter even if we do not scrutinize the states of wishful thinking, intoxication and fainting etc. of people who are perceived by us in the waking. What if those states are occurring to us only? Should we at least take into the reckoning those experiences or should we not? The answer to this question is only this much: Whether we are fully awake or not, when we assume that externally or outside us there is a world which is related to our waking, all the states that we experience as being related to that world are indeed belonging to the waking (and are subsnmed by it). If in any state there is not the least knowledge of the world, then from the point of view

Rarest Archive

of the determination of the Ultimate Reality there is no difference whatsoever between deep sleep and such a separate state. If more deeply observed, all the states that we have experienced hitherto and those which may occur to us have necessarily to belong to either of the two states : Our experiencing the existence of freshly appearing entities is one state; 'without any appearance whatsoever, 'being ourselves in ourselves' alone, is another state; if observed from this viewpoint, the two states of waking and dream, both of which have experiences of external appearances, will become one state only; wishful thinking, lunacy, delirium, somnambulism, half consciousness or stupor, hypnotized or mesmerized state — all these belong to this category alone. Deep sleep, fainting, intoxicated state, Yogic trance or *Samaadhi* etc.— such states wherein there is no knowledge at all of the kind of 'I' and 'another' belong to the second category. Death is not really a state. For, the fact that 'others die' belongs to or is included within our waking, and the fact that when we die how our experience of it will be is not known now and hence the experience of death cannot be taken up for consideration. The state of Liberation or Emancipation also must be similarly understood. Apart from this, barring the two kinds of experience, viz. the existence of external knowledge or its non-existence, we cannot imagine at all that we may get yet another kind of experience. Therefore, if the two states of *'Darshana Vritti Avastha'* or the state in which there is experience of manifestation — as in the waking and the dream states, and *'Adarshana Vritti Avastha'* or the state in which there is no experience of any manifestation, as in deep sleep — are both considered, then nothing remains to be considered at all. Therefore, if it is assumed that waking, dream and deep sleep are the only three states, it

Rarest Archives

becomes the comprehensive or consummate viewpoint. If these are considered, it amounts to considering all the remaining states alone (*Maandukya Kaarika Bhashya* 4-88). Although when seen from the viewpoint of the waking special features may seem to be there in those states, for our task undertaken for the purpose of determining the Ultimate Reality the consideration of these three states alone is sufficient.

41. The mutual relationship among the states:

After the determination of the fact that states are three only, the question as to what is the mutual relationship among the states can be reviewed. Previously (sub-section 29) while stating the salient features of the method of the three states we have mentioned that the knowledge of the fact that there is no mutual relationship among the three states is a significant feature of this method. Even so, people have a natural conception or notion that there must be some kind of a relationship among the states. If it is said that 'there are two entities but they have no relationship', this is not assimilated by or accepted by the intellect at all. In this world between any two objects or among many objects that we have perceived, the fact of their not having any relationship is not observed by us. Not only this, our intellect does not have the capacity to imagine two objects unrelated to each other. When it is mentioned that there are 'two objects', they must have either temporal or spatial relationship; they must have the relationships of the types of species (individual or part) — genus, or

Rarest Archives

supported — substrate; or some other relationship of this kind must exist. To know the thing that is being considered exactly or to communicate its knowledge clearly to others the relative knowledge is necessary. Without the relative knowledge the empirical dealings or transactions cannot be carried out. It being so, how can it be said that there is no relationship whatsoever among the states? Observed naturally, all the three states belong to the category or species of *'Avastha'*, or a state of Consciousness; as dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking and deep sleep is the rest or respite caused to the body, the senses etc., it can be said that among them there is a temporal as well as a cause-effect kind of relationship. Therefore, to many people the statement that there is no relationship among the states seems to be invalid.

But in the whole method of reasoning stated above, the identification with the waking-oriented viewpoint alone is reigning supreme. As we have explained before (sub-section 33), there is no wonder at all if such misconceptions are caused among people who have discarded the impartial viewpoint of the method of the three states and have clung on to the waking viewpoint alone. To bring home to the mind the fact that these beliefs or notions are not proper, the following ratiocinations based on Intuitive experience will be helpful: The people generally believe that waking, dream and deep sleep are occurring one after the other and that there is a cause-effect relationship among them, is it not? If this is true, there must be some interval or interstice between any two states; if not, the

Rarest Archive

fact of one state itself gradually attaining different forms must become our experience. But it is not so if we check up in our experience. No one has perceived the 'intermediate time' when the waking has gone and deep sleep has not yet come; no one has perceived the 'intermediate time' before the dream has come after the deep sleep has ended; nor has any one perceived the 'intermediate time' between dream and waking. Similarly, no one has seen waking getting changed or converted into deep sleep or deep sleep changing its form into dream or dream changing itself into waking; **even if any one had seen like that, all these would have become one state only. Therefore, there is no support of experience to imagine or assume either any temporal sequence or any cause-effect relationship among the states.** Another consideration: If it is true that the states follow on another, one on the heel of another, invariably, and if it is invariably true that there is a particular kind of temporal relationship among them, then they must be events occurring in some one time series only, is it not? If so, by which temporal yardstick or standard should their sequential order be measured? "On Sunday morning at seven one storm came; at eight several trees of that forest were uprooted and hurtled away" — When such a statement is being made, we observe the sequence of two events, viz. the blowing of the wind and the falling of the trees, taking the morning of Sunday as the only time as the substrate or basis for the two events; the blowing of the wind occurred first and from that cause later on the trees were uprooted — in this manner we imagine or assume the cause-effect relationship between them. But when we say: "On

Rarest Archive

Sunday afternoon I slept for three hours; in that moment I had a queer dream and it appeared to me that I carried out different kinds of transactions for 30 years and that I experienced different kinds of happiness and grief" — if we assume, that after the waking the dream followed, which common denominator of time for both these should we take as the basis ? Here the three hours of waking have become 30 years of the dream. Therefore, the measure or standard of waking time is too small for the dream, and the *measure or standard of dream time is too* big for the waking. There is no agreement whatsoever between the idea or notion of the time appearing to us in the waking and the idea or notion of the time appearing to us in the dream. Not only that, because the respective idea or notion of time of one state remains within its respective state alone, it is clearly evident that there is no one particular time series whatsoever which suits these two states at all. Does it not become clearly evident from this also that — (a) our assumption of a state to be a certain kind of temporal change occurring in us, and (b) taking that time to be the waking time alone, our attempt to measure or evaluate all the states from the waking viewpoint — are the main causes for the germination of the big mistake of assuming that 'the states come and go one after the other and there is a cause-effect relationship among them' ?

If it is well remembered as to what a state is, then there is no room or cause for any difficulty whatsoever to crop up regarding the relationship among

Rarest Archive

the states. As we have stated already before (sub-section 39), the states are not temporal changes occurring, nor are they stations which we reach to obtain rest or respite every now and then while constantly moving. **The different ways in which the Ultimate Reality appears alone are the states.** When this distinctive characteristic of a state is realized, the question itself as to what relationship is there among the states does not arise at all. For, relationship is that which exists among appearances perceived by us within the states. **In every state the whole of the Ultimate Reality is completely subsumed and it is never possible to reckon in the manner — "So much portion of the Entity or Being exists in this state and the remaining portion exists somewhere else".** Beyond the states no piece whatsoever of the Ultimate Reality can ever be hidden anywhere else; therefore, the time, the space and the relationship of a particular state – they 'do not know to stretch out even a wee bit' beyond that respective state. Only those people, who have not realized **the secret that 'each state thus has included the Ultimate Reality while being or remaining as It is, still it appears in the form of a state',** are victims to the delusion that there must necessarily be some kind of relationship among the states and, further, that a world comprising time, space, etc., which are rudimentary to build up that relationship, should necessarily exist beyond the states. But those — who have fully realized the fundamental rule that the whole gamut of appearances that is perceived by us in each state is itself the world and not anything else and therefore the world is included within the state and not that in the world the states occur (sub-section 27) — are

Rarest Archive

never caught by the 'ghost' of questioning as to what relationship does exist among the different states.

42. Though the states are mutually queer or quaint, they are not mutually different :

Now another conclusion derives itself from this and that is : **That the states are three also is a kind of a misconception formed by the association or identification with the waking viewpoint alone.** For, by the above-mentioned reasons themselves it is established that the states do not exist in any one time series or in any one space series. It being so, how can number affect them at all ? Number is a quality that adheres either to things that may be placed one by the side of another in one space continuum, or to events that occur one after another in one time continuum. Therefore, it is determined that to call states which have no temporal sequence nor spatial support "states" is itself wrong. Apart from this, imagination of the distinctions of *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality, *Karma* or action or imagination of a relationship of genus (class) - species (individual) among these viz. substance, quality, action or relationship of genus and species among them — applies only to appearances that we perceive in the waking, and hence they can never become applicable to the entire state itself. The whole language that we speak is born to communicate the experiences of the waking. Therefore, to insist stubbornly that that same language should be used to denote experiences which are beyond the waking, as also that the literary meaning of such

Rarest Archive

language should be taken, cannot be said to be 'discrimination'. In the objections raised before (sub-section 41) regarding the relationship among the states, the statement that — "We cannot at all imagine two things or objects having no relationship" — is made without knowing this subtle truth. Objects appearing in the manner of *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality, *Karma* or action, *Saamaanya* or genus, *Vishesha* or particular, *Samanvaya* or inherence, *Abhaava* or non-existence etc. — all these are appearing to the waking intellect alone. It is not possible for this waking intellect to know anything at all without any relationship. Hence, it is but common for people who take into the reckoning merely the waking viewpoint to get the delusion that without any relationship no experience occurs at all. But there is 'an experience' which 'observes' by objectifying the state itself (sub-section 28); this has the name of **Nirvikalpaka Anubhava or Intuitive experience** without any projections or dispersals. In the method of the three states alone this Intuitive experience is taken into the reckoning. When observed from this Intuitive viewpoint the whole waking state itself becomes an object to It. Then neither the experience of the intellect within the waking nor the transactions of substance, quality, action, relationship etc. pertaining to that experience (restricted to the realm of the intellect) are there at all. **If observed on the strength of this Intuitive experience, waking is not even 'one'. Because, in that (Intuitive experience or Intuition, to be short) there is no taint of number at all; in that case, wherefrom can another state which is second to It come? Therefore, even the transaction of treating the states to be three (in number) is also improper, indeed.** Just as

Rarest Archive

one rope itself is differently conceived as a snake, a water stream or a crevice or chink in the ground, we **are conceiving the Ultimate Reality Itself as waking, dream and deep sleep.** In the example, when the snake is there, there is no water stream, and when the water stream is there, there is no chink in the ground, and when the chink is there, the other two are not there; when the truth that 'this is a rope' is known, none of these, viz. snake, stream or chink', is there. Similarly, when one of these i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep is there, the remaining two are not there; when we Intuit the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality these three, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, are not there. Though counting these misconceived states as 'one', 'two' and 'three' is itself wrong, this conceived dealing or transaction is itself **assumed by Vedantins from the waking viewpoint alone;** this is done for the purpose of teaching the aspirant alone, but, in truth, they i.e. Vedantins, do not accept at all that these are three (*Maandukya Kaarika Bhashya* 4–90). Henceforth, whenever we transact that the states are three (in number) the readers must keep this secret in mind.

43. The Witness of the three states :

After showing yet another step in the method of the three states to the readers we will conclude this section. The greatest research among all in the method of the three states is *'Atman'* or the Self, who is witnessing the three states, is **the core of Being of the aspirant.** Previously (in sub-section 32) what we

Rarest Archive

had stated regarding the bifurcation as the observed-observer or object-subject — if that is remembered, then it will immediately flash to us that a state can never appear to us without our essential nature of Being or the Self, who is the prime subject witnessing them. In the above-mentioned sub-section we have denoted the one important difference between this Witness or subjective Principle (Pure Consciousness) and the observer or subject who knows the external world in the waking. In the waking, if we have to know anything we have to have the aid of the intellect; but while knowing the state we do not need the help or aid of anything else. What we experience in the waking is the **Savikalpaka Anubhava** or the experience with projections or misconceptions, which divides or differentiates as substance, quality, action etc.; while we know or experience the states what occurs is the **Nirvikalpaka Anubhava** or Intuitive experience without misconceptions or projections. On the strength of this Intuitive experience alone we are observing the three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep. Misconceiving as waking, dream and deep sleep is done by the intellect itself and not by this Intuitive experience without projections. Even to say that there is no mutual relationship among the waking, dream and deep sleep states we have this Intuitive experience Itself as the substrate or support. Whether these three states come or go, this our essential nature or core of Being, which remains in one and the same form and which observes and knows directly by Intuitive experience or its very innate or intrinsic nature of Being, is called by Vedantins **Saakshi or Witness. Apart from Vedantins who follow the viewpoint of the three states, none else**

Rarest Archive

has in his philosophical treatise propounded the essential nature of this Witness in this manner. (*Sutra Bhashya* 1-1-4). On the strength or support of this Witness the various verdicts that are arrived at by the Vedantins will be mentioned in the next Section.

(F) The Important Verdicts That Become Evident From The Discrimination About The Three States :

44. Atman or the Self is of the nature of Pure Existence or Being :

After knowing the essential features of the method of the three states, which is unique and exclusive to the Vedantins, as well as its greatness. it is but natural to get an anxiety to know the conclusions which are drawn from that method. Therefore, following the outline of the method described in the previous section, here we will denote the important declarations or conclusions of this philosophical science.

Our *Atman* or Self is an ever-existing Entity. It is not possible even to think or imagine that He does not exist. Without assuming that *Atman* or the Self exists we cannot carry on any transaction at all.

Rarest Archive

Existing in the form of this Self alone and with the aid of that Self alone, who is of the essential nature of Intuition, we transact in the manner — "All the remaining things or phenomena either 'exist' or 'do not exist'". Whether in the case of the states or in the case of the things or objects that appear within them, they are all imbued with 'existence' derived from *Atman* or the Self alone. The objects appearing within the states undergo changes, and the states manifest and unmanifest themselves, or in other words, they appear and disappear; but the existence of the Self or *Atman* who witnesses all these never gets mutilated or destroyed. Some people may feel in the manner — "In deep sleep I do not exist; because, the knowledge that that duo of 'I' and 'others itself does not exist therein." But they will have necessarily to accept that Intuition, with the help of which they discern the nature of deep sleep in this manner — that Intuition is there unfailingly and indubitably in deep sleep. That Intuition itself is their essential nature of Being. Therfore, *Atman* or the Self of all of us also is **Pure Existence only**, that means, He is of the essential nature of Absolute Existence or Being. **This is the first verdict.**

45. Atman or the Self is of the essential nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness :

Atman or the Self is knowing all the states. Because He is knowing them only, we come to know that we have states. It is not possible even to imagine that the Self does not have knowledge; because, even to

Rarest Archive

imagine like that the help of Intuitive knowledge alone is required. Only if it is assumed that *Atman* or the Self is of the essential nature of knowledge, transactions of the form of — "We come to know that the other things or objects have existence and that it appears that among them some have knowledge (or the abilty to know) and some others do not have knowledge (or the inability to know). In other words, some are sentient and some others are insentient" — become possible. In the waking we know by the intellect; it appears to us as if that that knowledge has birth and growth also. For that reason only people aspire to acquire knowledge. Thus although the knowledge that arises in the intellect is changing, the Intuitive knowledge of *Atman* or the Self is not affected, because *Atman's* Intuitive knowledge is ever of one and the same form, and for that reason alone it is possible to determine the occurrence and the passing off of external knowledge. Because in deep sleep there is no knowledge whatsoever occurring, it cannot be said that our *Atman's* Intuitive knowledge does not exist then; for, then the Intuitive knowledge, which tells us that then (i.e. in deep sleep) there is no (objective or external) knowledge whatsoever, at that moment also 'exists' in *Atman* — in this manner it will have to be accepted. Therefore, *Atman* or the Self is ever of the essential nature of **Pure Knowledge or Consciousness**, that means, He is of the essential nature of Absolute Intuitive knowledge. **This is the second verdict.**

Rarest Archive

46. Atman or the Self is of the nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss :

Atman or the Self does not have in His essential nature or core of Being any increase or decrease whatsoever and does not have any deep-seated grief or sorrow whatsoever. In Him there is no taint even of any misery or sorrow at all. We never feel that we do not want our *Atman* or Self. Howevermuch grief appears to have come to us, we do not entertain any feeling of disgust towards our essential nature of Being. We have extreme love for ourselves. Even when we have gained happiness we are established in our essential nature of Being alone. If we do not have any contact with anything outside, we come closer to our essential nature of Bliss. Even if deep sleep comes, there is no decrease in our Bliss. Then we have attained the essential nature or the very core of Bliss alone, which is greater than all else. Therefore, our *Atman* or Self is **of the nature of Bliss or Pure Happiness.** (i.e. He is of the essential nature of Absolute Bliss or Happiness). **This is the third verdict.**

47. Pure Existence, Pure Knowledge or Consciousness and Pure Bliss or Happiness are not qualities of Atman :

Atman's Existence, Knowledge and Happiness -- none of these is His quality; they are His essential nature Itself. *Atman* is not one 'having existence', but He is of th essential nature of Pure or Absolute Existence

Rarest Archive

Itself; He is not one who knows, but is of the essential nature of Absolute or Pure Knowledge or Intuition; He is not one who has happiness but is of the essential nature of Absolute or Pure Bliss Itself. Existence, Knowledge and Happiness — these are neither to be obtained by *Atman* from anything else, nor is it possible to be acquired anew (from outside sources). Whether the states come and go, He is or remains to be of the essential nature alone of Pure Existence, Pure Knowledge and Pure Bliss. From *Atman* alone the empirical phenomena of existence, knowledge and happiness get manifested in things or objects that appear within the states. **This is the fourth verdict.**

48. Atman or the Self is of the essential nature of Pure Existence, Pure Knowledge and Pure Happiness or Bliss :

Atman's existence is Absolute or Pure Existence of Being; in It there is no mixture whatsoever of anything else. When we say in our empirical dealings 'objects or things exist', in them many qualities are conjoined; but in the Pure Existence which is the essential nature of *Atman* no qualities whatsoever are admixed. Similarly, *Atman's* Knowledge is Pure (Intuitive) Knowledge; there is no object whatsoever to or apart from that Intuitive Knowledge of *Atman* Similarly, *Atman's* Pure Bliss is not the result of any contact or relationship with any outside object whatsoever; It has neither any separation whatsoever from any contact. In the world when people transact as saying — "I had happiness" — the meaning of that sentence is

Rarest Archives

that from a certain object or thing there was happiness acquired, indeed. But *Atman's* Happiness or Bliss is Pure or Absolute Bliss Itself and not that which has accrued from the contact with anything else. Thus *Atman* or the Self is of the essential nature of Absolute or Pure Existence, Absolute or Pure Knowledge and Absolute or Pure Bliss. **This is the fifth verdict.**

49. Atman or the Self is of the essential nature of non-duality :

In *Atman* existence, knowledge and happiness are not three (separate entities), just like the colour, heat and light or brilliance of a lamp are transacted to be 'three aspects' of one entity itself, i.e. the lamp, from three different viewpoints alone. That is all. This Absolute or Pure Existence-Knowledge-Bliss nature of *Atman*, neither in Itself nor from any other thing, gets any change whatsoever (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-3-7) **Although the states appear to be different or separate from this Atman or the Self, in reality they are not separate or different For, to say that there are two objects or things, they have to have necessarily the support of either time or space. But neither Atman nor the state is in time or in space at all; time and space are categories which appear within the state.** For this reason, *Atman* or the Self is non-dual, that means, an Absolute Entity or Reality that does not have or desiderate any other thing whatsoever which is capable of being called a second thing to it. In waking and dream though the not-self (*Anaatman*) which appears as if it is an object to *Atman*, because its (i.e. not-self's or *Anaatman's*)

Rarest Archives

contents are completely pervaded by the Pure Consciousness of *Atman* Itself, they are in reality *Atman* or the Self Itself. Especially in deep sleep, *Atman* alone exists (In other words, therein He exists unto Himself and by Himself). Therefore, it amounts to saying that ever the appearances which are said to be second to *Atman* do not exist; it also amounts to saying that the appearances or manifestations in the forms of waking and dream which occur in *Atman* are, in reality, the essential nature of Being of *Atman* Itself. Observed from this viewpoint, it should be stated that *Atman* is ever **Kootastha or immutable or changeless, Adviteeya or non-dual, Shuddha Satchidaananda Swaroopa or of the essential nature of Pure Existence or Being, Pure Knowledge or Consciousness and Pure Happiness or Bliss.** Vedantins call *Atman* in the name of *Brahman* with this meaning alone. **This is the sixth verdict.**

50. Atman or the Self cannot be objectified or comprehended (i e. perceived or conceived) by speech or mind :

Even calling *Atman* or the Self to be of the essential nature of Pure Existence - Knowledge - Happiness is a kind of an empirical transaction alone. If it is observed absolutely, the statement about *Atman's* Existence is made only to dispel the conjecture that *Atman* does not exist. Similarly, *Atman's* Knowledge is mentioned only to dispel the notion that He is insentient or inanimate in nature and *Atman's* Happiness or Bliss is referred to only to dispel the misconception that He is of the nature of misery or grief

Rarest Archives

(*Taittireeya Bhashya* 2-1). It is not possible to describe *Atman* in any manner like: "He is of this and this nature" or "He is of such and such nature". To be of an essential nature which can neither be stated by any speech nor be known through any percept is in itself the Ultimate or Absolute nature of Being of *Atman* (*Taittireeya* 2-9). Whatever words of the type — "He is of this nature"; "He is not of this nature" — can at best be only a certain kind of symbol used to indicate from afar His essential nature, but they are not capable of directly and by themselves reaching Him out and intimating to us. He who understands or realizes this fact with the aid of Intuitive experience without giving room for doubt is alone a *Jnaani* or Knower (Realized Soul), *Krita-Kritya* or one who has achieved the goal (of Liberation or Emancipation *par excellence*). **This is the seventh final verdict.**

If the above - enlisted verdicts, which we have stated here very briefly, are to be fully understood, the states will have to be once again considered more elaborately from the three viewpoints of Existence, Knowledge and Happiness. This task we will undertake in the next three Chapters.

Rarest Archive

III CHAPTER - THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF EXISTENCE

(A) Atman Or The Self Himself Is The Real Existence

51. Atman or the Self and Anaatman or not-Self;

Our *Atman* is of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence, of Pure or Absolute Knowledge, of Pure or Absolute Bliss; Existence, Knowledge and Happiness or Bliss are one and one only, not three. This *Atman* who is of the essential nature of Existence-Knowledge-Happiness is Himself the Ultimate Reality of everything; therefore, He is of the essential nature of non-dual Existence-Knowledge-Happiness — This philosophical teaching of Vedanta has been briefly indicated. In this philosophical teaching we get many doubts For example, how can Existence itself be Knowledge as well as Happiness? How can one conceive by the mind anything regarding "Pure or Absolute Existence" which is unrelated to anything else? How can we believe that *Atman* alone, who is of the essential nature of Existence - Knowledge - Happiness, is the Ultimate Reality, especially when in front of us the various things or objects exist? To get such other doubts resolved, we will have to carry on our discriminative examination more elaborately. Therefore in this Chapter the Ultimate Reality will be determined

Rarest Archive

from the viewpoint of Existence and the remaining topics will be taken up for consideration in the following Chapters.

In this book hereafter we will be using the two terms — *Atman* (Self) and *Anaatman* (not-Self) every now and then. *Atman* means our essential nature of the Witness of the three states who is shown by us heretofore; **Anaatman** means what is not *Atman*. A state, the world appearing within the state; or the different things or objects which appear within that world, their qualities or characteristics and relationships — all these are included in the term **'Anaatman'**, Keeping these two technical terms in mind becomes very useful for the forthcoming consideration. The word, *'Atman'* means 'I'. Therefore, whatever things or entities man imagines or believes to be his essential nature, all those things are *Atman* alone, from one point of view. For example, when we say — ' I am sturdy, am strong, or I am sick, or am emaciated" — we use whatever extends up to the body as 'myself'; this *Atman* is called **"Shareeraatma"** (physiological self). When we say — "I see, hear, imagine, know; I am living; I have a small span of life" etc. — we believe ourselves to be up to *Praana* or the vital or life force; this *Atman* is called **"Jeevaatma"** (the soul); similarly, when we say — "This is known to me; this is not known to me" — we assume what is there in us up to our intellect to be our *Atman*; this *Atman* is called **"Vijnaanaatma"** (intellectual or sentient being or self). When we say — "I am happy, miserable or unhappy" — whatever is

Rarest Archive

there in us up to the ego (*Ahankaara*) is believed to be our *Atman*; this *Atman* is called "**Bhoktratma**" (the enjoying ego or self). But when we say — "I am observing the waking state itself; the entire state itself is an object to me" — none of the *Atmans* mentioned so far is relevant. Previously what we have briefly described as "**the essential nature of Witness**" (*Saakshi Swaroopa*) is Itself what we call in that context "*Atman*". Thus because the word "*Atman*" connotes different meanings according to the context or the circumstances, it is better if we, at the outset itself, state with what meaning we use this word. Our essential nature of Being which witnesses the entire state is Himself called "*Atman*" by us. This *Atman* Himself is stated by us to be Existence-Knowledge-Happiness. Keeping this fact in mind, without for a moment forgetting it, the readers must scrutinize the following text. Because, for those, who do not discern as to which entity is *Atman* who is the subject-matter of Vedanta, no worthwhile purpose is seen in this consideration or discriminative deliberation.

52. Some defective characteristics of the term "existence" :

When we say — "*Atman* is pure or Absolute Existence" — what is meant by the word, 'Existence'? This question must be determined first of all. For, people generally or commonly call a thing that appears on the basis or support of a certain time or space and that which is useful for a certain transaction — 'It exists'. For example, water is now in the pond; if

Rarest Archive

it is touched, the hand gets wet; if it is drunk, thirst is quenched; therefore, we can say water 'exists'. Similarly, we sometimes say: "Now in my mind there is an imagination or conception; this is causing immense trouble to me". In this case, though the conception is not in any region or space, it is in time, furthur it is causing to the mind a result or an effect of a certain transaction. Therefore that also can be said 'to exist'. But if anybody asks: "In which region or space does *Atman* exist? In which time does *Atman* exist? To which knowledge does He appear to be? To which good or bad result or effect does He become useful in empirical transactions"? — To these questions there are no answers at all. That thing which appears or which we can anticipate to appear in the region in front of us — if not in another far-off region, if not in the present time — in the past or the future distant time, and which can yield a certain good or bad result in our daily dealings — that thing we can say 'exists'. But *Atman* does not 'exist' in respect of any of these meanings; let Him not be directly perceivable, but not even indirectly or abstractly it is possible to conjecture that He 'exists'! — Such a doubt may arise in the minds of many people.

53. The defect in these features or characteristics :

In order to get these doubts resolved, first we must examine the question — "Are the features or characteristics that are assumed here proper"? First of all, if anything which appears in time or in space

Rarest Archives

is said to 'exist', then neither time nor space is fit at all to be said to 'exist'. For, time does not exist in any other time category or in space; similarly, space does not exist in any other space category, nor in time at all. Some modern scientists are saying that time and space are not two separate entities, but both of them together form the fourth dimension of an object (Einstein and some other modern scientists have opined that time and space together form the time-space continuum, the fourth dimension, along with the commonly known dimensions of length, breadth and height of any material object), i.e. existence of a material object is expressed in terms of four dimensions. Even then, the argument that time and space do not exist in another series of time and space unavoidably remains without being answered or solved. Further, if what appears is to be said to exist, then mirage water appearing to exist at a distance also will have to be said to 'exist'; in the desert it appears as if there is water at a distance, and also it appears as if in it the trees are throwing their reflections topsy-turvy. But there, water does not exist at all; if all that appears is fit to be said 'to exist', then the mirage water too will have to exist. But the fact is not like that at all.

Anyone may provide a kind of a solution to this. That is: Merely because it appears to exist, a thing does not get existence; some kind of a positive action must be performed by that thing which appears in that manner. For example, the thing that appears as water — if it wets a cloth, if drunk it quenches the

Rarest Archive

thirst etc. — in such a manner if it is capable of causing a result, then we say 'water exists'. If a thing merely appears to exist without there being any proper action in this manner, then that is existence appearing out of delusion and that is not true existence; therefore, that thing which appears and causes a resultant action alone is fit to be said to 'exist' In such a manner the clarifications with regard to the characteristics will have to be made. But even after such clarifications and stipulations are made, the defects in the characteristics cannot be avoided. For, in the dream also by the water that is appearing to us therein the thirst is quenched there and cloth is wetted; that water therein is also useful for bathing etc. Even so, we do not reckon that water to exist really. Therefore, it is evident that **it is not proper to say that having a resultant or efficient action is itself a characteristic of existence.**

Here the opponent or disputant may improve upon the characteristic of existence in another manner. For instance, things that appear to us in the dream appear in our individual or personal dreams only; but the things which we say as 'existing' in the waking appear to everyone 'to exist' invariably. Therefore, what appears to exist to one individual may 'exist' without being real also; but to the existence of that thing which appears to exist invariably to everyone there is no fear or threat whatsoever. If a thing appears to one individual as 'existing' and later on to him only it appears as if it does not exist, or if it appears to one and at the same time it does not appear to the

Rarest Archiver

others, it may be said that either in that individual's senses or in his mind and intellect there must be some defect or other. But it is not possible to say that what is appearing to exist invariably to everyone does not exist; for, to understand or reckon that either in everyone's senses there are defects and deficiencies at one and the same time or that everyone is devoid of intelligence can never be proper or justifiable. For that reason, that thing which appears to everyone to exist as also causes a resultant, efficient action can be believed to have real existence, is it not? — In such a manner anyone can ask. But the stipulation or regulation that a thing that is existing should appear to eyeryone cannot solve our present quandary at all. For, first of all the assumption itself that 'in the dream the things or objects appear to us individuals and that in the waking the things appear to everyone' is not proper; for, this differentiation is imagined on the basis of the viewpoint of the identification with the waking alone (refer to sub-sections 23, 33). For the time being, even if this defect is disregarded, in this characteristic of existence there remains another defect. For example, to the question — "What is meant by the statement — 'A thing exists'?" — if an answer to the effect — "That which appears as if to exist to everyone" — is given, how can it be satisfactory? Which kind of a thing appears to exist? In what manner if the thing exists should people believe it 'to exist'? This indeed s the question here. To this question it does not amount to our having found now any answer at all. In fact, it amounts to our giving the answer: "If a thing exists, it should be believed to exist." Apart

Rarest Archives

from this, if it is contended that — "If a thing appears to exist to everyone, it should be believed to exist" — in order to decide that a certain thing exists, then it implies that people of all times and all regions will have to be gathered together. This is neither possible, nor anyone of us do undertake this task in our daily transactions for deciding existence. Another point: Those who say that all the people should agree or accept a thing to exist, on which other universal acceptance should they decide the question — "Do all those people exist or not?" By such an unsettled or unestablished sentence no characteristic is truly determined at all.

Anyway, so far we have made explicit the various defects in (formulating or stipulating) the characteristics of the form of — "That which appears to our knowledge, i.e. consciousness, in time and space and which causes positive or efficient action 'exists'" Now we will show yet another predominant defect in this characteristic. If what appears is said to exist, then does that knowledge, to which that appears, exist or not? How can this question be determined? If that knowledge or consciousness also, while appearing to another knowledge or consciousness only, begets existence, that new knowledge will have to appear to another knowledge and the latter too to yet another knowledge (and so on and so forth) — In this manner it will have to go on appearing, one to another, *regressus ad infinitum*, and such an indeterminate state will be reached, is it not? On which basis or support should we accept such a series or line of

Rarest Archive

many knowledges which do not have a finality? If we do not agree or accept in that manner, we will have to agree that one particular knowledge exists without itself appearing, is it not? If we agree to that, then how does the characteristic of the type — "That which appears itself exists" — can be sustained?

54. The characteristic of existence: what is real existence?

Therefore, all these are not the characteristics of 'existence'. **That which can never be imagined or conceived not to exist — that is really existing. That which does not change giving up its essential nature of being and further there is no possibility at all of it changing, that thing alone is the really existing entity** (*Taittireeya Bhashya* 2-1). There is never any possibility of a really existing thing changing at all. If observed in this perspective (i.e. with this meaning or purport), not a single thing that appears to us is fit to be said 'to exist'. Our *Atman* or Self alone is the really existing Entity. This fact is brought home to our mind by the examination of the three states. For instance, if the waking state is analytically observed, that appears in the two forms of 'I' and 'the rest' (i.e. subject and object); rolling these two appearances into a lump as the waking state, our *Atman* is observing it as the Witness. Similarly, the dream also is appearing in two heaps of the forms of 'I' and 'the rest' and our *Atman* is observing that too as the Witness. In deep sleep not a single thing is appearing at all, even then this Witness Himself, i.e. this *Atman*

Rarest Archive

or Self, exists (by Himself and unto Himself). If then (i.e. in our deep sleep state) our *Atman* did not exist, we could never say: 'Nothing whatsoever appeared therein'. In any case, *Atman* ever exists as the Witness of the three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep; in His essential nature of Being there is no change whatsoever. As we have previously (sub-section 40) shown, because there is no other state whatsoever apart from these three states, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, and further because it is not possible even to imagine that there may be yet another state apart from these, it amounts to saying that *Atman* or the Self who is the Witness of the three states is ever existing in one and the same form; further, it amounts to saying that this *Atman* is an Entity which does not give any room even to doubt that 'He may not exist at any particular time, (*Maandukya Bhashya* 7). But the appearances of the groups of 'I' and 'the rest' seen in the waking and dream are not of this nature; they have entry only in the waking and the dream. It is determined or established as being absolutely final on the strength of our Intuitive experience that these appearances which are there in the waking are extremely different from those in the dream and that in deep sleep there is not the least room for any of these (appearances of the two categories of 'I' and 'the rest' of the waking and the dream). Therefore, it is not possible at all to say that these are really existing entities.

Rarest Archive

(B) The Three Stages Or Levels Of Existence :

55. What kind of existence is that which 'Anaatman' has ?

In that case, do not the states and the objects or things appearing within them have any existence whatsoever ? If not, what is the cause for the belief that they exist arising in us unfailingly ? The answer to this question has to be sought out now. In the waking, though some things appear to exist for the time being, later a new knowledge to the effect that they are mere appearances and that in reality they do not exist is born, falsifying or cancelling the old knowledge. For example, the silver of the sea-shell or nacre, snake of the rope etc. — these, although they appear to be real at the time of their appearance, when the things are fully examined, the knowledge that 'they never existed there' is born. Therefore, we can agree if it is said that such mere appearances do not have any existence whatsoever. But when a particular object seen in a particular manner in a particular time and a particular space appears to exist in the same manner or state even after examination, how can we say that it does not have any existence ? — This kind of a doubt arising is but natural. If it is to be said that this world appearing in front of us and the past and the present happenings appearing in it do not really exist at all, then is there no value whatsoever to the secular and spiritual acts or rituals that we perform here as well as

Rarest Archive

to their fruits? Our desires and aspirations; gain and loss; success and defeat; happiness and grief; righteousness and sin or unrighteousness; help and harm; heaven and hell; inquiry and instruction or preaching — are all these mere old ma's dream only? In such a manner many people may keep asking.

To those who are capable of understanding the rationale (tenor of argument or line of thinking) behind the method of the three states as well as its strength, there is no need to provide an answer to the above question. For, neither waking nor dream can exist independently apart from *Atman*. Their existence being that of *Atman* alone, instead of the world becoming false it 'exists' as *Atman* Himself, who is eternally and really existing (*Chaandogya Bhashya* 6-2-3). In due course too (sub-section 56-59) this matter will be further clarified. But to give satisfaction even to the weak-minded people who cannot rise up to that level there is an answer and that is: As shown above, because *Atman* is of an essential nature of Being or Pure Existence, which never changes nor the existence of which can ever be denied, His Existence, called **Paramaartha Satta** or the Pure or Absolute, Real Existence which is eternal, is felt to be true; merely on that account, it does not become evident that for the things or objects that we see in the waking there is no existence whatsoever. For, all those objects are for the most part fit to be transacted as they exist'. In the world, among the things that are perceived by us some may appear to be eternal like time and space; some others may appear to exist for a very

Rarest Archiver

long period of time like the earth, stars etc,; yet some others may appear to exist for a very brief moment of time like the water bubble, a lamp held across a breeze etc. Whatever be this difference, the eternal objects as well as the non-eternal objects appear to us to exist invariably till the time of their appearance lasts. On the faith that they really exist alone we are using them in empirical transactions. Therefore, they also have existence. Just as the existence of those things is real, similarly after they are destroyed their non - existence is also real — in this manner all of us are convinced. In the world, just as people are troubled by excessive rains, they are also put to trouble only when there is absence of rains at the proper time. In our daily or empirical dealings just as there is value for excessive rains, in the same manner there is value for a lack of rains or drought. For that reason alone, we believe that all the things in the world appearing to us to be existing and non-existing are existing only from the waking viewpoint. But because they are not capable of transcending, or crossing over, beyond the waking state, their existence which is useful for the empirical (i. e. waking) dealings alone can be called **"Vyaavahaarika Satta"** or the existence really appearing in all empirical transactions. Why only this? Even those like the nacre-silver, rope-snake, the second moon etc. which appear to us for brief periods as a result of delusion in our waking state have existence. As long as they appear to us, we believe that they too 'exist' only. When it is ascertained in the manner — 'this is not silver-it is nacre; this is not a snake but a rope; this is not a second moon - but one moon

Rarest Archives

only' — then alone their 'existence' vanishes. Though the rope-snake, the second moon etc. do not have the existence that is utilized in all the empirical transactions, they also have '**'Praatibhaasika Satta'** or apparent existence or semblance. Anyhow, whatever things appear to us to our consciousness all of them have 'Pure or Absolute Existence' invariably; a thing that does not have 'Pure or Absolute Existence' does not exist at all. Even our transaction of non-existence is a kind of 'existence' alone and nothing else.

56. Atman's Pure or Absolute Existence Itself is appearing in Anaatman too :

But here we must remember one fact without fail. We should never think at all that the existence that appears either in the states or in the world that appears within the states is an independent, their own, existence. It is from this point of view alone that we have previously (sub-section 54) stated that they, i.e. either the states or the worlds appearing in them, do not have the qualification to say — 'they really exist'. By giving an example this opinion can be clarified. If water or an iron piece is kept on burning charcoal, which is that heat that is appearing in that ? Which is that sweetness that appears in the liquid sweet prepared out of vermicelli, sweet cake or a sweetmeat ball of wheat flour etc. ? In these cases, do we think that the heat of the burning charcoal is one and the heat that is seen in either the water or the piece of iron is another or that the sweetness of sugar is one and the sweetness that is seen in the

Rarest Archive

liquid sweet of vermicelli, sweet cake and the sweet ball of wheat flour etc.- is another? No. Similarly, to think that 'the states or the world appearing within them, which are together of the form of *Anaatman* and which appear only in the presence of *Atman*, have an existence which is their own, exclusive' is wrong only. As it is stated in the "**Dakshinaamoorthi Stotra**', to reckon that — "That *Atman's* manifestation of the form of Pure or Absolute Existence Itself pervades and manifests in the unreal or misconceived objects or things" -- alone is proper.

57. Atman's Existence is not a category of existence :

The **Taarkikas** or logicians have divided the things or objects appearing to us in the waking world into seven categories, viz. *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality, *Karma* or action, *Saamaanya* or genus, *Vishesha* or particular, *Samavaaya* or inherence, *Abhaava* or non-existence. *Prithvi* or earth, *Ap* or water, *Tejas* or fire, *Vaayu* or air, *Akaasha* or space, *Kaala* or time, *Dik* or directions, *Atman* or soul, *Manas* or mind — these nine are *Dravya* or substances; form, taste, smell etc. seen in them are *Gunas* or qualities; climbing and descending etc. are *Karmas* or actions; *Prithvithwa* or earthness in earth, *Apthwa* or waterness in water, *Roopatwa* or formness in form, *Rasatwa* or tasteness in taste etc. — all these and *Dravyatwa* or substantiveness in substance, *Gunatwa* or qualityness in quality, *Karmatwa* or action-ness in action — all these together with *Satta* or existence are common features or *Jaatis* or species or categories; the eternal relationship

Rarest Archiver

between the categories of *Ghatatwa* or potness and individual members like pot etc. as well as the eternal relationship between the qualities of a substance and the actions of that substance are called *Samavaaya* or inherence; the things which denote the difference between the ultimate atoms of earth etc. and the categories like time, soul and mind are called *Visheshas* or the particulars. All the things or objects which we have described from *Dravya* or substance to *Visheshas* or particulars are of the nature of existence or *Bhaava;* what is not existence is non-existence or *Abhaava*. Anyway, that there are seven things or phenomena like *Dravya* etc. is the teaching of Vaisheshikas (a school of philosophy in India).

Neither describing the entire methodology of the Vaisheshikas nor attempting to refute it — is the subject-matter related to the present discussion. But it is essential here to state a couple of facts relating to what the Vaisheshikas call **Satta** or existence, which is genus (*Jaati* or categories). For, although there are not disputants or protagonists today who follow the Vaisheshikas' philosophy in all its aspects, among the scholars of our country the conventional practice of deliberating upon the assumption of the divisions of *Dravya, Guna* etc. has remained even today. The Vaisheshikas say: *Jaatis* or categories are eternally inhering (existing) in the individual members through a certain queer relationship called *'Samavaaya'* or inherence. For example, in an earthen pot all the categories (*Saamaanyas* or *Jaatis*) like *Ghatatwa* or potness, *Prithvitwa* or earthness, *Dravyatwa* or substantiveness

Rarest Archiver

and *Satta* or existence are inherent. These categories are more and more pervasive in that order. For example, *Ghatatwa* or potness exists or inheres in pots only; but *Prithvitwa* or earthness inheres in pots as well as in other objects made out of earth. *Dravyatwa* or substantiveness is not only existing in *Prithvi* or earth but also in substances like *Ap* or water, *Tejas* or fire etc. But *Satta* or existence is the *Saamaanya* or *Jaati* or category existing in all the three viz. *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality and *Karma* or action. The readers should keep it in mind the fact that according to this philosophical teaching *Satta* or existence is really a quality or nature that is inherent in objects, as also the fact that just like the fragrance is inherent in a rose, this *Satta* or existence is eternally inherent in them, i.e. the objects or things. Because it is the opinion of the Vaisheshikas that this *Satta* is the *Parasaamaanya* or the highest category among all that is inherent in all *Dravyas* or substances, according to their philosophical teaching that *Satta* inheres not only in objects or things that appear to us in the waking but also in our *Atman*. Just as in the liquid sweet of vermicelli because sugar exists the liquid sweet is sweet, similarly in all the substances because *Satta* inheres only, they are fit for the transaction — 'they exist'. Thus these logicians opine. It is gathered that in the Western countries too, in the past, some thinkers were saying that in this manner a certain quality of nature called genus or *Saamaanya* was really inhering in objects or things; for example, in all houses there is a special or uncommon nature called house-ness really inhering. Thus the theory that *Satta* or existence etc. are categories which

Rarest Archive

are inhering in objects or things is merely an imagination hypothetically assumed to facilitate empirical transactions, and there is no evidence whatsoever to establish that they 'really exist'.

Let this be anything. We can easily discern that the 'existence' that we have taken up for consideration at present is not a *'Saamaanya'* or category of this kind. For, as we have previously (sub-section 43) stated, *Atman* is a Witness of the states as well as the world that appears within the states. Whenever He (*Atman* or the Self) 'begets' the experience of anything, that thing is invariably an object to Him. Therefore, the existence that is there in objects which appear to us in the waking also is an object to this *Atman* or the Witness (i.e. our essential nature or core of Being or Pure Existence). Even if we accept that existence is a certain category or *Jaati* that inheres in objects, because that thing or *Jaati* also is objectified by *Atman* and illumined by Him, that category also is 'pushed out' by Him (i.e. He remains aloof). But *Atman's* Pure or Absolute Existence is not of this type. That means, it is not possible at all for *Atman* to objectify His existence in this manner and know it; for, that existence is not His *Dharma* or quality or characteristic : it is His *Swaroopa* or essential nature of Being. It is also not possible to say that *Atman* has divided Himself into two parts like existence and knowledge and then by the part of knowledge He knows or experiences the other part of existence; for, even the parts and the thing having these parts — are both belonging to *Anaatman* which is an object to

Rarest Archives

Atman; *Atman* always remains or exists as the subject alone, while *Anaatman* always remains or exists as the object alone. Therefore, it is established that the existence that is in *Atman* and that is *Atman's* essential nature alone is queerer than the existence of either the state, which is different or separate from *Atman* and which appears as an object to Him, or the world that appears within the state. Therefore, even if it is accepted that, as the logicians or *Taarkikas* say, the existence that appears in the *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality and *Karma* or action, which are there in the world, is a *Jaati, Saamaanya* or category or genus, it is still established that *Atman's* Pure or Absolute Existence is not at all a *Jaati* or category.

59. Atman's Existence is not mere intellectual knowledge ;

For this reason alone, it is to be understood that *Atman's* Pure or Absolute Existence is not any extraordinary conception too. The *Vijnaanavaadins* (a Buddhist school of thinkers who are protagonists of the philosophy of a kind of Idealism) say : "Existence is not a category or genus that is in objects; it is a certain conception alone or Idealism only; because the external world itself does not exist apart from the mental conception, Idealism itself is existence". But if intellectual knowledge or mental conception (*Vijnaana*) itself is existence, all knowledges or conceptions also will have to become existence itself. There is no cause for one conception to appear as pot and for another as a piece of cloth. If intellectual knowledge

Rarest Archives

or conception can be existence and at the same time can also be pot and a piece of cloth etc., then why does it appear once as existence and at another time as pot? — To this question there is no answer. Apart from this, people in this world think in the manner — "This is a pot, this is the conception or knowledge of pot" — only, and no one thinks that the pot as well as the knowledge is one and the same. Therefore, the philosophy of Idealism or *Vijnaanavaada* is opposed or is contradictory to universal experience. We will take up this philosophy of Idealism once again while discriminating upon the Ultimate Reality from the viewpoint of knowledge (sub-section 92). For the time being, it is enough if this much is understood, viz. if conceptual knowledge itself is existence, then we should not at all get the experience of the type — 'Now there is conceptual knowledge, now it is not there'. For, according to this philosophy as everything is conceptual knowledge alone nothingness also will have to be conceptual knowledge alone. But for those who say or maintain that conceptual knowledge itself is existence, it is not possible to give a cause for the conceptual knowledge appearing as non-existent. Apart from this, because we are experiencing in the manner — 'Conceptual knowledge exists, conceptual knowledge does not exist' — it is quite clear or evident that the experiencing principle or ourselves are separate or different from the experienced conceptual knowledge (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-2-28). Such being the case, how can it be proper to say that the existence of the conceptual knowledge which is the object and the existence of *Atman* or the Self, who is the subject or Witness, is one and the same?

Rarest Archive

Some Westerners say: Knowledge is not a thing which can be expressed piecemeal in the manner — 'My knowledge', 'Your knowledge'; knowledge is really not a thing which does not depend upon another. It is an independent category (*Saamaanya*). The whole world or universe is a wheel of such independently existing knowledges only. In this wheel of knowledge existence also is one entity. The conceptual knowledges are mutually related; they are concealed or hidden, one in another; one among them can, if desired, be separated and observed. For example, 'existence' is the essential nature or the very core of a thing which remains after all its other characteristics are given up. To know a flower as a flower many characteristics or qualities that are in it are the causes; as much the people know these qualities or characteristics and observe the thing, so much their knowledge of the flower keeps on varying. But however much differently people might have known the flower, no one has any dispute as regards the fact — 'that it is an existence'. Thus 'mere or pure existence' devoid of any characteristics means nothing existing only. Therefore, in this sense existence (*Satta*) and non-existence (*Asatta*) become one and the same. Existence also has no characteristics, nothingness also has no characteristics. All the objects in the world are thus formed from certain characteristics, and these characteristics are knowledges only. Therefore, existence and knowledge become one and the same. As stated above, because in pure existence 'nothing existing' (non-existence) is also included, combining 'being or existence' with 'non-being or non-existence' it is possible to establish a new kind of knowledge called

Rarest Archives

"becoming". Similarly, the knowledge called 'becoming' combining with another opposite knowledge, yet another new kind of category of knowledge emerges. Similarly, if we go on examining we get 'unrelated or absolute knowledge', which is greater than all else. Thus the followers of the German philosopher Hegel, have expounded a certain new Idealistic philosophy.

It is not our intention either to describe this philosophy elaborately or to refute it. The readers can very quickly find out that the existence that we are explaining at present is not of this kind. For, even the unrelated or absolute knowledge which is independent has to be imagined by the one who wishes to know by himself with his mind only. In that event, how can the 'unrelated or absolute existence' come within the purview of the knowledge which is imagined on the strength of his own knowledge alone? The statement — 'when all the characteristics of objects are discarded the pure existence remains' — especially is a mere imagination. For, no one in the world believes that even when all the characteristics are gone the object exists. Therefore, this philosophy also is opposed to universal experience. This kind of 'mere or pure existence' is always beyond imagination. Which object does exist without any characteristics? Even if it is accepted that somehow or other 'pure existence' can be imagined, then also it will have to be stated that existence has the characteristic of being pure or absolute, is it not? Further, if it is stated especially that in pure or absolute existence

Rarest Archive

'nothing existing' or 'non-existence' is included, it does not convey any meaning. For, if 'non-existence' itself is 'existence', then the statement that one is included in the other becomes redundant; the statement that 'existence' is included in 'existence' does not have any meaning, is it not? Further, if it is said that existence and non-existence are different only, then the separating characteristics which denote that the two are different must exist in them. But with which tongue can those who have accepted that there is no characteristic whatsoever either to pure existence or non-existence utter that they are different? Thus this philosophy of Idealism is inferior in all respects to the Idealistic philosophy of our country. Therefore, in this sense also existence does not become conceptual knowledge.

59. The world's existence is that of Atman Himself:

In that case, apart from *Atman's* existence in the states as well as in the world there is one existence appearing! Which is this existence? If it is neither the *Satta Saamaanya* or the category of inherence which the logicians or *Taarkikas* propound nor the nature of conceptual knowledge that the philosophers of Idealism propound, then what should it be reckoned as? Previously (sub-section 56) you also have stated that *Atman's* existence Itself is appearing in the world also, is it not? Why should not a similar kind of objection that you raise against the theory that existence of knowledge (*Vijnaana*) itself is the existence of the world be applied to the theory of *Atman's* Pure

Rarest Archive

Existence ? You yourself had said (sub-section 55) that in the world too there are existences of empirical (*Vyaavahaarika*) and delusory (*Praatibhaasika*) types ! Does that not become contradictory or opposed to your present opinion that *Atman's* existence itself is the existence of the world ? That '*Atman* is Pure or Absolute Existence — you also had said (sub-section 48); what is the difference between that and the pure existence which Absolute Idealistic philosophers state ? — Thus any one can ask.

To find out a solution to this doubt, not only the waking but also the dream and deep sleep states will have to be examined. For, although the knowledge that appears in the waking as well as the objects that are objectified by that knowledge are appearing to us as 'things existing', it is not possible to determine without any shadow of a doubt in that state, i.e. waking state, itself that their existence is not independent. The waking does not appear without the 'light of *Atman*' who is its Witness; similarly, in the case of dream and deep sleep also; to those states also the Knowledge of the Witness or *Atman* is undoubtedly necessary. **It is not possible even to imagine that whether it is waking or dream or deep sleep, none of them can exist apart from this Saakshi or Witness (Atman) : as soon as we start to imagine that these states can exist by themselves devoid of the Witness's Knowledge, immediately their exitence becomes zero. Therefore, the Witness's Existence Itself is their existence; that also is 'taken on loan' from the Witness and not their own; therefore, it becomes evident that**

Rarest Archive

the essence of their existence is the Witness Itself (i.e. Atman, the Self or Pure Consciousness). Now if we attempt to inquire about the essential nature of the Witness (*Atman*) its existence is capable of being or subsisting by Itself without any dependence on anything else. It is not possible even to imagine that there is no existence in the Witness; for, even for that imagination also the existence of the Witness is needed. It being so, it becomes established that what is objectified by the Intuitive experience of the Witness (*Atman*) is Itself the existence of the states and hence there is no meaning whatsoever to the imagination that the existence of the Witness might have come from something else. Therefore, it is to be stated that the Witness or *Atman* Himself is the essence of the existence of the states. When the lot of the existence of the states itself is like this, what need is there to say anything about the existence of objects or percepts like knowledge etc. which appear in the waking state, which is one of the states? Therefore, it becomes indubitable that **whatsoever and wherever existence is there in the universe or the world, the essence of all that is Atman Himself who is their Witness.**

60. The support of Intuitive experience to substantiate the truth that the Pure or Absolute Existence of the Witness Itself is all kinds of existence:

If it is so, what is the cause for the Pure Existence to appear in different ways like 'the world's existence', 'the existence of objects', 'the existence of

Rarest Archives

conceptual knowledge', 'my existence' etc. in the waking? In addition to this, as you yourself have previously stated, the rope has the *Vyaavahaarika Satta* or the empirical existence, while the rope-snake has delusory existence or *Praatibhaasika Satta*. It being so, how can one understand or reckon that the existence appearing in these two cases is one and the same? — Anyone can ask a question like this. To this question also an answer can be found out on the strength of the experience of the dream alone. Look at the dream: In it, just as in the waking, there is a diffe-ent world of the form — 'I', 'my knowledge', 'the rest' etc.; therein also, just as in the waking, some appearances as having false existence with '*Praatibhaa-sika Satta*' or delusory existence and some others as having real existence are seen. Even so, we do not reckon that these different objects really exist there. Even in that event, to say that the Witness or *Saakshi*, who is observing the waking state, is Himself observ-ing the dream, the 'memory' to the effect — 'I saw a dream' — itself is the evidence or support. Seen in this light, the existence of our *Atman* who is the Witness in the dream is one only; even then, there i.e. in the dream, just as in the waking, the diffe-rence or division of the type — 'my existence', 'the existence of conceptual knowledge', 'the existence of objects' — is invariably seen. Therefore, though the existence of the Witness is one and one only, we have to imagine by inference that It (the Pure or Absolute Existence of the Witness) can appear as many existences. We never feel that the existence of the Witness is different either in the waking or in the dream. We cannot imagine at all that this Witness

Rarest Archive

can remain without existing in the waking or the dream or at any other time whatsoever. Either in the waking or in the dream with regard to anything which seems to be other than the Witness we can doubt in the manner — 'Does it exist or not? Did it exist in the past or not? Will it exist in the future or not? What existed in the past, does it exist now, or is it something else?' (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-2-25). But as regards the Witness who is our essential nature of Being such a doubt can never arise at all; for, the Witness is a Witness Itself for time also. Not only that, the belief of existence itself has come to us by virtue of the Intuitive experience or Pure Consciousness of this Witness or *Atman*. On whatever things the light of the Pure Consciousness or Intuitive experience of this Witness falls, all those things appear to exist only as long as they appear. Therefore, the existence that is there in them is that of the Witness Himself; it is the shadow alone of the Witness's Pure Existence — this fact is established. To show that one existence itself can appear to have divided itself into different things or parts, the experience of the dream itself is an illustration — this fact is also evident. We may not know the cause as to why one existence itself appears differently; but about the fact of its appearing like that, there does not remain any doubt whatsoever.

Rarest Archive

(C) Pure Or Absolute Existence

81. In deep sleep everything has become Pure or Absolute Existence Itself;

If the experience of deep sleep is discerned, this opinion becomes still more strengthened. For, there whatever world that appears in front of us, as in the case of the waking and the dream, does not exist at all. Just as it appears in those two states, there i.e. in deep sleep, the divided appearance of the form of 'I' and 'the rest' does not exist; just as we have a belief in the remaining two states that to know 'the rest' we have the means or instruments of knowledge, there in deep sleep we do not have any belief at all. Because there are no appearances whatsoever, the division also to the effect that some among them are true knowledge and some others are of delusory nature does not exist there in deep sleep. Thus without any divisions whatsoever of knowledge of the forms of existence; I, you, they, world; real and false etc. — deep sleep is of a nature wherein our Witness alone exists. Although it is determined thus that in deep sleep nothing whatsoever exists, yet it is not possible to say at all that there our essential nature of the Witness also does not exist. For, having known the deep sleep state by virtue of the Pure Consciousness or Intuitive experience of the Witness alone, we are now, in the waking, saying that in deep sleep there does not exist any division whatsoever. If in deep sleep we ourselves did not exist, there would not have been any cause for our having

Rarest Archiver

the experience like — 'That is our deep sleep state'. If it were true that in deep sleep we also become non-existent only, just as we all dread death, more dreadfully than that we would have had to dread deep sleep. Any one indiscreet or ignorant person may also say — 'I was not there in deep sleep'; but because he said like that only, the discerning or intelligent persons determine that 'he existed' in that state and for that reason alone he is stating now (in his waking) that 'he did not exist there in deep sleep' in the form of 'I'. Therefore, what is it that is the reality of deep sleep? There we exist, but not in the form of 'I'; there we do not have a split-up knowledge of the form — 'This is of this nature' (*Sutra Bhashya* 1-3-19, 3-2-7); the external object which is perceptible to that knowledge also does not exist (*Brihadaaraṇyaka Bhashya* 4-3-23). But our *Atman* or Self who is the very core or essence of our Being exists there also; that *Atman* exists in the form of the Witness. In fact, on the strength of the Intuitive experience or Pure Consciousness of that Witness alone we say that 'there I did not know anything, there nothing whatsoever existed.' If we observe still more deeply, we will have to say that then our *Atman* does not exist even as the Witness. For, when there exists anything that can be experienced as the witnessed (object), then only our *Atman* gets called 'the Witness'; in deep sleep, apart from *Atman* any object whatsoever that is fit to be perceived or experienced does not exist. Therefore, it has to be deduced that there our *Atman* remains in the Pure or Absolute nature of Being in which there is no division of 'external object' and 'internal conceptual knowledge' and where-

Rarest Archives

in existence and knowledge have merged into one essential nature or core of Being. All that we are now perceiving in the form of 'I, my knowledge, the external world which is an object to my knowledge' — all these are merged there into *Atman* alone. *Atman* who exists now in the waking exists alone, by Himself, there also. **Therefore, it amounts to saying that what we now call 'deep sleep' from the viewpoint of the waking is really not an Avastha or state of consciousness at all.** For, the mode of appearance of the Ultimate Reality is called *'Avastha'* or a state of consciousness; this has already (sub-section 39) been intimated. But in deep sleep nothing whatsoever appears at all. Therefore, it is not an *Avastha* or state. Because when we see it from the viewpoint of the waking we do not see there another thing just as in the waking, we believe that that deep sleep is 'a state or *Avastha*, with nothing existing, nothing appearing'. But in reality there in deep sleep there is neither any divided or partial knowledge itself needed to know in the form of — 'this is such and such a thing' nor the divided or partial existence itself of the object which can be objectified or perceived by that conceptual knowledge: then, by what can be anything, or in any manner, known? (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 2-4-14). Our *Atman* Himself is then all existence, all knowledge: then 'existence and knowledge' have become one absolutely. Therefore, *Atman* has to be said then to exist in the form of 'Sanmaatra' or Pure or Absolute Existence. **For people who see with the waking viewpoint this secret is never known.** Day to day, although they are merged in this *Atman* or state called 'deep sleep' —'they do not know that it is so even in spite

Rarest Archive

of the fact that they have merged into Pure or Absolute Existence' — (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 6-9-2). This Pure or Absolute Existence is, in reality, everyone's own essential nature of Being also ; therefore, because of the reason of their merging into their own essential nature of Being, the name of '*Swapithi*' (*Swa* means in oneself, *Apeetha* means merged, *Bhavathi* means becomes — that is, he sleeps) is used for them in practice, customarily — so says the **Chaandogya Upanishad** (6-8-1). If observed from this viewpoint, **our existence and the existence of the entire world appearing in front of us as well as the different existences in it which appear to be divided into many phenomena is our Atman alone of the nature of 'Shuddha Satta' or Pure or Absolute Existence which is our essential nature itself in deep sleep.** From this the conclusion that 'from that Pure or Absolute Existence alone the three kinds of existences mentioned before emerge out and appear' is further strengthened.

63. Explanation of the statement that there is no existence of the world in deep sleep :

Here it may appear to some people that : Because dream is a mere delusion, as long as the dream lasts it appears as if in it there is a world and in that world there are objects of empirical existence or reality (*Vyaavahaarika Satta*) as well as objects of illusory existence or reality (*Praatibhaasika Satta*). But all that is mere appearance alone and not real at all. Hence it is not possible to compare that world of appearance and its objects to the real world that we

Rarest Archives

are perceiving now in the waking and to the objects which are perceived here in the waking world, and then equate them. Therefore, it is quite proper only to say that the appearance which was seen as long as the dream lasted does not exist either in deep sleep or in waking when the dream is not there. But how can it be accepted that the world that is seen in front of us now also disappears in our deep sleep? What reason is there to say that merely by our going to sleep this world does not exist or that it disappears? Because the experience of the world differs from person to person, in case even if it is said that the world experienced by a particular person does not exist during the period of his deep sleep in the same form as he had experienced it in the past, it may be proper. But can it be said that the world does not exist at all? As there are yet so many other people like us in this world, they can carry on their own transactions even during the period of our deep sleep, is it not? Apart from this, what a ridiculous statement it is to say that the external world and the objects, creatures, men and everything in it come and conceal or merge themselves in our deep sleep! We do not have the experience of any of those things hiding or merging in our deep sleep; nor do we have the experience of those things emerging out of our deep sleep when we wake up from sleep. No one among the people that we see agrees or accepts the statement — "We had merged in your deep sleep; now because you hav become awake we have emerged out of your deep sleep." It being so, how can it be proper to say, quite contrary to experience and logic, that in deep sleep there does not exist any world whatsoever

Rarest Archives

and at that moment our *Atman* or Self alone exists in the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Existence or Being ?

These kinds of problems or difficulties arise only in the case of those who have forgotten the warning which we have already (sub-section 33) given. That the dream is a mere appearance and that this world exists as it is even if we are asleep is a belief which is caused by the identification with the waking alone. We will show in the near future (sub-section 71) that there is no difference whatsoever between dream and waking. But for the present deliberation that is not so much necessary; for, in the above objection it has been accepted that the dream world does not exist anywhere during the period of deep sleep. Therefore, it is enough at this juncture if it is determined whether the world that appears to us in the waking exists in deep sleep or not. If any person is asked the question — Is it possible to see the world that we witness in the waking in any other state whatsoever ? — there cannot be even a couple of answers to that. That world is capable of being seen in the waking alone; it is tied down to the waking alone (sub-section 27); the statement — "That world exists when the waking is not there or when the world is not there the waking exists" — has no meaning whatsoever. Now observe : The waking, the world seen or appearing in the waking — between these two we cannot at all push the world outside. But our state alone keeps on changing. Every day we who are awake are having deep sleep also. If deep sleep

Rarest Archive

comes and waking goes, the world — appearing along with it alone — also goes or disappears invariably If it is said that when we are asleep also this our waking world exists — then it amounts to saying: "Then we are also sleeping, we are also awake." This is a ridiculous statement. Therefore, it is not proper to believe that when we are in deep sleep the world is hiding somewhere in one corner outside us. Therefore, there is no objection whatsoever against what we have said, namely, the entire world has merged within us.

Even so, people believe that even when we are asleep the world perforce exists! What is the reason for this? We can say that among the general run of people predominantly there are two misconceptions which are the cause for this belief; one is the feeling of the nature of — "That world alone existed yesterday also and that world alone is appearing to us today also" — that feeling or belief we get as soon as we get awakened; the other one is the feeling or notion of the nature of — "If we had not gone to sleep at all, the world would not have become non-existent". Here, let us assume that the feeling of — "That world itself is this world" — is the proper one; let us also say that the statement — "If we keep awake only, this world also would appear in this manner alone" — is proper. But merely by that, will it be established that the waking world exists in deep sleep also? The memory of the nature of — "That world itself is this" — also belongs to the waking state only; the identification or innate feeling of the

Rarest Archiver

nature of — "This world always appears to us in this manner only" — also belongs to the waking state alone. It being so, how much rational or proper can the conclusion that we draw by observing from this waking or empirical viewpoint to the effect — 'This world exists perforce in the deep sleep also" be? If anyone argues that — "If we consider from the deep sleep viewpoint and say: 'In deep sleep no world ever appears; if we were always sleeping only, that world would never have appeared; therefore, in the waking too that world never appears at all' — will it be proper? No. **Just as the conclusion drawn by taking the deep sleep viewpoint does not suit the waking viewpoint, similarly the conclusion drawn by taking the waking viewpoint does not suit the deep sleep viewpoint.** In the waking state the world appears, while in the deep sleep state it does not appear. Both these are experiences only; between them, one is not more valuable or important and the other less valuable or important. Therefore, giving both the experiences an equal value only, we should only say that — "The waking world does not exist at all in the deep sleep state." Similarly, we should only say that — "The dream's delusory world also does not exist at all in deep sleep." We should also accept that — "Our *Atman* or Self, who is determined on the strength of Intuitive experience — He exists in all these three states, namely, waking, dream and deep sleep, invariably."

The statement that — "Like us there exist so many people in the world" — is proper alone accord-

Rarest Archive

ing to the waking viewpoint; but as we have stated previously, when we observe from the viewpoint of our Intuitive experience or Pure, Absolute Consciousness, both the world and the people who are supposed to be in that world — all of them — are tied down or confined to the waking state alone. Therefore, the one Intuitive experience alone of the nature of — 'When we are asleep we do not have the waking state' — is enough for the above determination. For the examination of the problem — "Whether the world existed apart from us or not when we were asleep?" — there is neither any need whatsoever of the evidence of the statements of people who are confined to the waking world alone, nor is there any possibility of their statements lending any strength (support) or causing any weakness (defect) to our determination (or conviction).

Further, the objection to the effect — "We do not have the experience of either the world receding within ourselves when we go to sleep or the world emerging out of ourselves when we become awake" — had been raised, is it not? This objection also is contrary to experience and is vitiated by the identification with the waking. For, when should the world receding unto ourselves be known to us? In deep sleep the knowledge of anything is not possible; and as the world invariably exists in the waking, there is no cause for that world to appear as having merged or receded unto our Self or *Atman*. Apart from this, just as we see in the waking a snake entering a hole and later on coming out of it, to see

Rarest Archive

the waking enter into deep sleep and emerge out of it — is deep sleep a thing or object outside us like the hole ? No. Therefore, this objection also is not tenable. Hence the statement of fact that 'in deep sleep, barring the Self or *Atman*, all the remaining things or phenomena have merged into *Atman* alone' is unobjectionable or irrefutable. Therefore, that everything is *Atman* Himself of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence or Pure Consciousness is the final philosophical teaching only.

63. The summary of the deliberation made so far on Pure Existence :

How should an aspirant (*Jijnaasu*) discern that 'the Ultimate or Absolute Reality behind the existence of himself as well as the world is *Atman* or the Self alone, of the essential nature of Absolute or Pure Existence' can be known from the methodology delineated so far. If the important links in this chain of discrimination are once again mentioned, it will be helpful for the deliberation of the forthcoming topic.

1. Because the states of waking, dream and deep sleep are experienced by myself alone who is the aspirant, and because apart from these three states there is no other state whatsoever which deserves consideration, if these three states are considered or examined in accordance with experience the

Rarest Archive

essence of the Ultimate Reality should be known.

2. Because each one of these three states is an independent variety in which the Ultimate Reality appears, in these the Ultimate Reality i.e. *Atman* or the Self, appears wholly or completely alone.

3. Therefore, waking is equal to dream, dream is equal to deep sleep, deep sleep is equal to waking; each one of these is an appearance only of the Ultimate Reality or Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness, Pure Bliss.

4. When these three states are fully or exhaustively examined their Reality Itself is the Absolute or Ultimate Reality of the whole universe.

5. In both the waking and the dream states this Ultimate Reality is appearing by splitting Itself into the forms of 'I' and 'the rest'; in deep sleep It is appearing as the mere or Absolute Witness. Because this Witness or *Saakshi* exists in the waking and the dream also without being mutilated or changed, it should be stated that the Witness which exists in the deep sleep Itself appears as 'the Witness', 'I', 'the rest' in the waking.

Rarest Archive

6. Because the fact that 'I myself am the Witness. to me alone the three states are appearing' is determined or ascertained by Intuitive experience, the Ultimate Reality or essence of Being of the 'I' which is in the waking is the Witness alone. The Witness is my *Atman* alone.

7. As in deep sleep there exists the Witness alone, that Itself is the Ultimate or Absolute Reality; this Witness or *Saakshi* alone appears not only as 'I' in the waking and dream but also appears as 'the rest' which is not 'I'.

8. Therefore, the Witness Itself, existing in all the three states in Its essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness, just like a thread stringing together the beads, is providing the Intuitive experience of the nature of — 'I am experiencing the states'; it should be discerned that the Witness alone is appearing as the states of the form of His own 'imaginary transformation'.

9. That deep sleep is a state also is a statement made from the waking viewpoint only; really, deep sleep is the Witness Itself and nothing else whatsoever. Therefore, the statement that "in deep sleep, *Atman* is the Witness" — also is a mere statement made for courtsey's sake (sub-section 83). **If observed Intuitively i.e. from the viewpoint of Pure or Absolute Consciousness, deep sleep is Pure or Absolute Atman**

Rarest Archive

or Self (Consciousness) alone. *Atman* is the essence itself of the existence of all that appears in the waking and the dream.

10. Because in this Atman of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence or Being there are no parts whatsoever, the 'I' that appears in the waking is wholly or completely Atman alone, the thing that is not 'I' appearing outside also is wholly or completely Atman alone.

11. Although in the waking many people who are no myself but who are like me are appearing as if they exist, each one among them is wholly or completely this *Atman* alone. Everything also is *Atman* alone of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence Itself.

12. This Pure or Absolute Existence Itself is appearing as 'the existence of the waking', 'the existence of the dream', 'the empirical (*Vyaavahaarika*) existence (*Satta*), illusory or delusory (*Praatibhaasika*) existence (*Satta*)'. In reality, apart from *Atman* who is of the nature of Pure Existence (*Paramaartha Satta*) nothing else whatsoever exists at all.

Rarest Archive

(D) The Varieties Of Or Different Forms Of Existence

64. That Atman is non-dual Pure Existence is not opposed to the theory of three grades of existence ;

To the question — "The opinion that *Atman's* Pure Existence Itself is the world's existence is opposed to the theory of the three grades of existence, is it not?" — now it amounts to have found an answer. *Atman* and the world are not different; *Atman* and the states of waking and dream are not different; *Atman* Himself is appearing as these states alone and as the world in these states. Therefore, *Atman* Himself who is of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence is appearing in the waking and the dream in the form of three kinds of existence — the real or Pure Existence (*Paaramaarthika Satta*) of the Witness (*Saakshi*), the existence of the states and the empirical or mundane existence of the various percepts appearing in the states (*Vyaavahaarika Satta*) and the delusory existence of some illusions appearing in the states (*Praatibhaasika Satta*) — all these are subsumed in the whole, namely, 'Pure or Absolute Existence'. If it is truly observed, though there are no parts whatsoever in Existence, by virtue of the different viewpoints, that very Ultimate Reality Itself is appearing to us in three grades of existence, viz. in Its form of *Atman* as the Pure or Absolute Existence, in Its form of the states as the empirical or mundane existence and in Its form of objects projected by delusion as the delusory existence. **Therefore, the Ultimate Reality is indeed one Existence (Pure or Absolute) alone;**

Rarest Archives

the other existences are indeed Its different forms only. Therefore, the theory of the three grades of existence is not opposed to the theory of Pure or Absolute Existence.

65. Even if a thing is opposed or contrary to the waking logic or reasoning, if it is in agreement with Intuitive experience it should be accepted :

Now another question arises : The statement that — 'One existence alone being in its essential nature in deep sleep, yet in waking and dream it attains different forms — is a contradiction, is it not ? Between the form of Pure or Absolute Existence, which we have so far determined, and the form of waking and dream there is such a great difference ! The existence that is there in deep sleep is of one kind only; there is no distinctive quality or feature whatsoever in it; in it there is no variety, no division, no feeling of genus and particular, no feeling of any quality and it is one endowed without quality, without action and without any feeling of object and subject. If the waking world is observed all these are there. It appears queerer, keeps on changing without any break; acquiring ever new forms or roles and engendering a feeling of cause and effect, it is 'a stage or a theatre' of percepts getting born and destroyed. It being so, how can it be believed that that very Ultimate Reality, though having no distinctive features in Itself, yet can exist with various features ? Is it not opposed to reason ?'

Rarest Archive

This mode of thinking is natural to those who have not kept in mind the special features of the viewpoint of the three states. For, if it is remembered that the Ultimate Reality appears wholly or completely in each one of the states, and hence the three states are equal to one another from the absolute viewpoint i.e. the point of view of the Witness, there is no hindrance in arriving at the conclusion that the Pure or Absolute Existence that is there in deep sleep is nothing but the existence of the waking and the dream only. For this method of discrimination we have taken the Intuitive experience of the Witness alone as the support; there is no other experience which can falsify that Intuitive experience. **To establish or stabilize the edifice of determination of the Reality on the foundation of comprehensive or consummate Intuitive experience is a special feature of the method of the three states (sub-section 28).** Calling the statement — 'One entity itself exists without change, it exists with change also' — as a contradiction is a logic that we have formulated from the waking viewpoint. But if observed from the viewpoint of Intuitive experience, the Pure or Absolute Existence which existed in deep sleep without any special or distinctive feature appears to become endowed with distinctive features as well as with changes. Therefore, giving up the attempt of arguing or reasoning against one's Intuitive experience one should accept the verdict of Intuitive experience alone. Discarding this principle, if more value or importance is to be given to logic alone than experience, then it can also be argued in the following manner, even after seeing a person sitting in front: "This person is not sitting here, because he is a man;

Rarest Archive

it is clearly evident that others who are men — none of them is sitting here; because this person also is a man, how can it be said that he is sitting here?" None of us accepts that this kind of logic is proper. Therefore, the logic that does not agree with experience should be brushed aside and not the experience saying that the latter is against logic. For that reason, the logic or reasoning mentioned above should be taken to suit only the waking; for, in the waking one object or thing itself being with change as well as without change is not seen by us. Similarly, no object whatsoever being as it is, still it being transformed or converted into other objects or things has ever been seen by us. While clay becomes a pot or a seed becomes a tree, many constituents in it have to undergo changes. This also is a certain rule or regulation that suits the objects or things that are there in the waking. Because it is in our experience that *Atman* who is in the form of Pure or Absolute Existence 'exists' as He is and by Himself in deep sleep and appears in both the waking as well as the dream as the world full of various percepts, the logic or reasoning of the kind — "An object being as it is cannot be changing also" — should not be made applicable to *Atman* or the Self who is of the nature of Pure or Absolute Existence. The non-dual Pure Existence which is devoid of special or distinctive features 'having become many', 'becoming endowed with concepts of righteousness and unrighteousness', 'being endowed with divisions', 'transforming Itself into conceptual knowledge as well as insentient or inanimate objects' — all these must be similarly reconciled; for, all these have been seen to be in our experience.

Rarest Archive

Therefore, logic or reasoning should be adapted to be in consonance with intuitive experience, but one should not attempt to brush aside or topple over one's experience on the strength of logic. This alone is the reason for the statement in the *Brahma Sutras* (2-1-11) to the effect that 'if by dry or pseudo logic one carries out discrimination the Ultimate Reality can never be found out and (even if some thing is apparently decided or concluded as the Ultimate Reality) that finding will never have finality or any certitude.'

86. The meaning of the statement that Pure Existence alone is the cause for the whole universe:

In the present context, to get rid of the defect of logic the expedient or clever plan is to discard the logic of the waking viewpoint and to follow the reasoning in accordance with one's Intuitive experience alone. This alone we have called 'the Comprehensive means of reasoning' (*Vyaapaka Yukti*) — (refer to sub-section 30). In which manner should the present discrimination or deliberation on the strength of this kind of 'comprehensive reasoning' or 'reasoning based on Intuition' (*Sattarka*) be carried out? The answer to this question is: Deep sleep, dream and waking are not in reality three states. Our knowing that they are three is also from the waking viewpoint (sub-section 42). Observed from the standpoint of Intuitive experience (*Saakshi* or Witness), deep sleep is Pure or Absolute *Atman* or Self; that is Pure or Absolute Existence alone. In It there are no space or time or the concepts of cause and the caused (effect) at all.

Rarest Archives

Our conception that dream and waking are different from Pure Existence and that there is some kind of a relationship between Pure Existence and these two states alone is the cause for this opposition (between dream and waking experiences). Our waking intellect cannot know anything without relative knowledge. The concepts of time, space and cause-effect are natural to it; it can know only objects which have the dimensions pertaining to categories like time, space, different objects or things. Therefore, it (i.e. the waking mind) has formulated certain logical axioms or rules. Following these axioms or rules only the waking intellect has conceived that waking, dream and deep sleep are three different states and that there must be some kind of a relationship among these states. If it is observed properly, the states are not three, one has not emerged out of another; it is not proper also to say that there is a relationship among one another The Ultimate Reality exists as the Absolute Reality alone. Even so, because the intellect is saying that the states are three, we must determine or decide, by using the comprehensive reasoning which is in accordance with Intuitive experience, that the states are not existing at all separate from Intuitive experience (or Pure Existence). The states are not transformations of Pure or Absolute Existence; just as a seed grows into a tree, Pure Existence has not grown and become (or has not been transformed or converted into) the states. For transformation or conversion the assistance of time, space and causation is necessary; time, space and causation do not get transformed whatsoever, they are the adjuncts needed for the transformation of an object or a thing. But in *Atman* of the form or nature of

Rarest Archiver

Pure or Absolute Existence, which we in common parlance call *Sushupti'* or deep sleep, there is no time or space or causation whatsoever. **Atman or the Self is the essence or core of time, space and causation also; Pure or Absolute Existence Itself is appearing as time, space and causation.** Therefore, this effect or phenomenon which occurs without desiderating or depending upon time, space and causation is not transformation as it is popularly understood in the world (i.e. in our mundane transactions). When the seed gets transformed into a tree, it gets broken up and only after its own form completely disappears it becomes a tree. But when Pure or Absolute Existence gets 'converted' as waking and dream, It does not in this manner lose Its form or nature or they do not disappear whatsoever; It subsists as It is, in the waking as well as in the dream also. For that reason also, it is not a transformation as it is understood in common parlance in the workaday world.

In any case, when we say that Pure Existence becomes waking and dream, it becomes evident that the cause-effect relationship which the people **in the world** talk about is not there in both these cases (viz. waking and dream). If we have to say that Pure Existence is the cause and these two states are the effects, then for the words — 'cause' and 'effect' — we will have to assume afresh a different technical connotation. In **Panini's Grammar** words of feminine gender ending in the sound 'ee' are given the symbol of 'Nadee' (which means a 'river'); merely on that ground, we do not take it to mean that in these

Rarest Archives

words there is water, is it not? Similarly, the statement that Pure Existence is the cause for the world also should be understood in a technical or special sense. Pure Existence does not get transformed or converted into the world; It appears as the world. The special or distinctive features appearing in the world, the differences among them, the concepts of qualities and an object having, or being endowed with, those qualities, the relationships of action and a thing endowed with activity or being active, the discrimination of a thing being real or false — none of these is the effect of Pure Existence, all these are Pure Existence alone. Not only the different objects which are appearing here but also the adjuncts which are the cause to show that they are different are Pure Existence alone. Thus the phenomenon of a thing remaining as it is and appearing as a different thing is called *'Vivarta'* or illusory appearance. Just as in the world the rope being rope alone, during the period of delusion appears as a snake, and just as the rope and the (appearance of) snake exist as not different things or entities, and understanding or conceiving that there must be a certain relationship between the rope and the (appearance of) snake will be wrong or improper (i.e. it will be a delusion) — just as they are truly one and the same — similarly the whole or totality of waking is Pure Existence alone, the whole or totality of dream is Pure Existence alone. Thus, if the *'Vivarta'* or illusory appearance of Pure Existence alone is understood or conceived to be waking and dream, then the real purport of the statement — "Deep sleep, waking and dream — all these three are the forms of Pure Existence alone" —

Rarest Archives

could be said to have been found out. **If this is remembered, it would amount to have properly understood the profundity or subtlety of the concept of cause and effect mentioned in the Upanishads.** "My son, just as — if one knows a lump of clay, it amounts to one knowing all the things made out of clay, just as — change is merely a name alone and is an object for mere talk only, but in reality it is not an entity, just as — there (in the above instance) the clay alone really exists, similarly that Ultimate Reality also, which is the object of teaching, exists" — (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 6-1-4, 5, 6); "That this Ultimate Reality or Pure Existence alone is the subtle cause for the world; for all this world this (Pure Existence) alone is the essence or core of Being; this (Pure Existence) alone is the Reality, this alone is *Atman*, That Thou Art." — (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 6-8-7) — for these statements this alone is the opinion or purport.

(E) Division Of Reality And Unreality

67. The string or list of objections against the division in the theory of Pure or Absolute Existence ;

Now a big question arises : If Pure or Absolute Existence is one or non-dual alone, how did the

Rarest Archives

division of 'reality' and 'unreality' occur in It? If it is said that there is no separation or division of 'reality' and 'unreality' at all, how would it be proper for you to have said that Vedanta is a philosophical text or treatise which determines the Ultimate Reality? How could any subject-matter for any philosophical treatise be obtained and from where? Without assuming the division between the Witness (*Saakshi*) and the state (*Avastha*), this your Vedantic discrimination itself cannot function, is it not? First of all, how was this division formulated or established? To this itself you do not have an answer. How did the states become three? Within the states how did the division of 'I' and 'the rest' come about? In fact, the world, which appears outside myself, having divided itself into substance (*Dravya*), quality or characteristics (*Guna*), action (*Karma*) appears with the concepts of genus and particular (or individual) and is seen endowed with different relationships! For all such duality (diversity) and difference what is the cause? In fact, among these wherever one observes there are distinctive transactions of the nature of — 'this is real', 'this is unreal or false'. Why is it so? More than everything, all the people in the world are indeed deeming that waking is real and dream is unreal or false; how can this be proper in your opinion? All of us have generally believed that the waking is a state which displays or shows up a world which is established by evidence, while the dream is a state being caused by the deficiency or defect of sleep. In the waking, using the real objects we obtain the real benefit; in the dream everything is mere appearance. In the waking we get together with

Rarest Archive

many people and carry on transactions; the dreams are occurring separately to each one of us. The world appearing in the waking is the same in the past, in the present and always; but the dreams are different each day; not only that, in one night itself there may occur so many dreams. After we wake up from the dream, it is known in the manner — "All this is a dream, a mere appearance" — but we never realize that waking is a false appearance. Looking at all this, it has to be said that the existence of the dream is inferior alone to the existence of the waking, or even if it is said that the dream is a mere appearance alone and not an existence whatsoever, it would be proper. Is all this not contrary to the opinion or teaching — "Pure Existence is the one and the only Ultimate Reality; apart from It there is no other existence at all"? Even after seeing that in everyone's experience there is difference as well as division of the type of 'reality' and 'unreality', how can it be reasonable at all to refute it?

68. For the division as well as difference appearing in Pure Existence the waking viewpoint alone is responsible:

The string of objections enumerated above appear as having no solution whatsoever owing to the failure to bring to mind the special or unique features of Intuitive experience which we have already mentioned. For, in the question: "If Pure Existence is one and one only, how did the division of the type of 'real' and 'unreal' arise in It?" — the separation of the

Rarest Archives

form of — Pure Existence is one, 'the real and the unreal' is two — has been made. But who said that Pure Existence is one? How can it be said that Pure Existence, which has transcended or which is beyond the categories of time, space and causation, is one or many? One, two — these numerals are the particular characteristics belonging either to objects which can exist one by the side of another in space or to events which can take place one after another in time. It being so, how can it be said that Pure Existence is 'one'? In the *Upanishad*, it has indeed been said about Pure Existence in the manner — "One without a second" — (*Chaandogya*); the ignoramuses who have not understood that this statement has been made to denote that — "That (Pure Existence) is not one having a second" have misconceived that 'Pure Existence' Itself is one only (in number). For this, the cause is their viewing everything from the standpoint of the waking intellect or mind alone. Similarly, if the Vedantins say — "Pure Existence is the one and the only Reality" — people with the viewpoint of duality will think that 'there exists the rest or remaining part (other than the Reality) separately and that is unreal'. But the fact is not so; "Reality is one, unreality is two — in this manner there are no two things or entities" (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 1-3-52). In the same manner, if it is stated — "*Atman*, who is of the nature or form of Pure or Absolute Existence alone, is the Witness of the states" — people understand it in the manner: "The states exist separately apart from *Atman* and *Atman* is the second entity observing them as the Witness". This also is not correct. For, separate from the indivisible Pure or

Rarest Archive

Absolute Existence neither the Witness nor the state or states exist at all. The Witness is not one, nor is the state second to the Witness. Just as, if to one mango another mango is added the number becomes or amounts to two, the state 'squatting' or placing itself by the side of the Witness does not become the second to the latter i.e. the Witness. In fact, the Witness i.e. Pure Existence or Consciousness, the Self, and the state are not entities which belong to the same species or category. The Witness is Pure or Absolute Existence alone, and apart from 'Existence' no characteristic or special feature whatsoever of the nature of witnessing has entered into It; in truth, the state also is an appearance perceived by the intellect or mind which has not discerned, divined or intuited the Pure Existence. Just as, if to a person who has not known it to be a rope, a snake 'appears' and that snake cannot be said to be the second (entity or thing) existing along with the rope, similarly, the state cannot become the second thing to *Atman* or Pure Existence. Just as the rope-snake, i.e. the appearance of the snake misconceived in the rope itself, is really the rope itself and in that snake the separate parts of the kind of the tail, the hood etc. which appear owing to delusion — none of them whatsoever is really existing at all apart from the rope, we are variously misconceiving the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence Itself as the state as well as the world appearing in the state and the whole gamut of appearances with divisions like the word or sound, the perceptions and their objects, viz. substance, qualities, actions etc. Just as we misconceive one clay alone as a lump of clay, a pot, a

Rarest Archive

pitcher, small earthen pot etc. and are carrying on our routine transactions, and if observed properly, they are all clay alone, similarly here also it should be understood. Just as for people who have fully discriminated and scrutinized the 'name of snake' as also its 'knowledge' disappear and the conviction of the nature of 'this is a rope alone' is born, similarly here also it should be understood that Pure Existence alone appears as the *Anaatman* or not-Self which is of the nature of various names and knowledges (experiences) — (*Chaandogya Bhashya* 6-2-3). While seeing the state, the mind or intellect does not have the Intuition of *Atman* or Pure Consciousness; when the Intuitive experience of *Atman* or Pure Consciousness is attained, the knowledge of the state does not exist. Not only that, the mind or intellect itself does not subsist in the form of the mind. Then it has really become *Atman* alone. How this can be — will be depicted later on (sub-section 135) when we consider 'Pure Knowledge or Consciousness'. Let it be.

The mind or intellect itself has never seen *Atman*, i.e. Pure Existence, and the state as two entities at all; even so, it thinks that two different entities or objects addressed or denoted by the two words — 'the Witness' (*Saakshi*) and 'the state' (*Avastha*) — are invariably existing; for that reason only, it is asking the question — "How did the two divisions or parts of the forms of 'the Witness' and 'the state' occur"? If observed from the viewpoint of the Intuitive experience (*Anubhava*), the state that appears to the Witness

Rarest Archives

is like a reflection of the face appearing in the mirror; it is really the Pure Existence alone which is the essence of the Witness and does not exist separately. For the reflection there has to be a real support or base like the mirror, the face has to be separate from it and should be in front of it — such regulations at least are there. But in this manner *Atman* is not in front of anything whatsoever. *Atman* who is beyond time and space, is not one to whom the category of cause-effect can ever be made applicable. Therefore, it cannot be said that He has somehow been transformed into the form of the state. *Atman* is Pure or Absolute Existence alone, the states do not exist at all. To obstinately persist in saying that because the two words of the type — '*Atman*' and 'the state' (*Avastha*) — are being used and because it is being stated that '*Atman* is the real existence and the states are not really existing', the duality of the nature of '*Atman*' and 'the states' perforce become evident is to betray a lack of wisdom alone. For, by mere usage or transaction of words and their meanings no substance can ever be established (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-2-15). Similarly, in the case of the statement — 'the states are three'. Just as in a story being concocted and narrated by a grandma to the children, if it is said — "To a king there were three children; among them two were not born at all, the other one did not enter into the womb even" — a boy who does not know anything or who is innocent and ignorant will count in the manner — "Two plus one is three; therefore, the three children are accounted for" — similarly, this waking intellect or mind, counting the words of waking, dream and deep sleep, thinks that

Rarest Archive

the three states are accounted for. If observed truly (from the standpoint of Intuitive experience) what goes in the name of a state is itself the delusion or misconception of the intellect or mind; for the stupidity or idiocy of the intellect which thinks that there are three such delusions at one time alone (in one time series) with regard to one object or entity alone, what can be said ! But by blaming or finding fault with the intellect in this regard there is no purpose served at all, for it is not possible for that intellect to exist alone; as an object to it something or other necessarily has to be there, and that object has to be with differences (or distinct features). Understanding in this manner alone is its habitual practice. Similarly, it should be imagined in all cases like — "In the states the divisions of 'I' and 'the rest', the divisions of substance, quality or characteristics and actions, the divisions of waking and dream exist". If observed from the Intuitive experience of the really existing Witness, nowhere there exists any division whatsoever, no duality whatsoever exists; the entity of *Atman* who is devoid of special features and who is of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Existence alone exists. Even so, seen from the viewpoint of the intellect or mind, all that appears as being divided and with different forms. Those who think that the knowledge of the waking intellect or mind alone is real experience (*Anubhava*) become deluded by the 'magic of duality'. But to those who, taking the Intuitive experience of the Witness (Saakshi) as the basis or support, use the comprehensive reasoning the steadfast conviction or sense of certitude that — 'Pure Existence alone, which is without any fluctuations or ups and downs, without any divisions

Rarest Archives

or mutations, without anything as second to It, is the Ultimate Reality' — is obtained.

69. Intellect or mind does not know to determine the the essential nature of a thing different or separate from Pure Existence :

There is another method of reasoning to say that by the mere statement of fact viz. 'In the waking world there appear various kinds of divisions', no threat or harm whatsoever is there to the philosophical trurh, viz. 'Pure Existence alone is real.' That is, although when seen from the waking viewpoint there (in the waking world) various kinds of divisions, different objects and certain types of relationships among them do appear, if the waking intellect or mind is asked to determine the essential nature of these divisions etc. it shakes its hands, so to say, and accepts its inability to do so. The craze of deciding for the moment anything that is seen to exist as it appears belongs to the waking intellect. But that intellect does not have faith in itself. Merely if it is asked : 'Once more deliberate and then answer'', immediately it says : "That is not like that, it is like this." For instance, look: The world that appears to this mind appears as having **the divisions** of 'I' and 'the rest' ; both these 'I' and 'the rest' seem to exist in time and space; 'the rest' appears to be subject to the divisions of substance *(Dravya)*, quality *(Guna)* and action *(Karma)* ; the faith that 'the multitude itself of action, the means of action and the fruits of action is this world' is developed. Now regarding this time-honoured or traditional belief

Rarest Archive

let us ask some questions, one by one. **By what is this division of 'I' and 'the rest' caused? Which is that dividing instrument or implement with which 'I' is disconnected or separated from 'the rest' and the rest' from 'I'?** — In this manner let us ask this 'dividing' mind. That spontaneously gives the answer: "All that is there up to my body is 'I' and the remaining is 'the rest'. Now ask the question: "Is the body 'I' or is it not the 'I'?" Then what does the mind say? Once it says — "The body is 'I' myself alone"; when it occurs to it in the manner — "I am going, I am standing" etc. — it is its belief that this kind of knowledge alone is proper. But at another time it gets notions of the type of — "My body has become emaciated", "For this task I will sacrifice my body even" etc.; then this mind itself says: "The body is not myself, it is mine". The question — "What this stuff (substance). called 'I' is?" — is to be taken up for an elaborate examination later on (sub-section 142). but for the present this much is enough. The mind does not have any certainty regarding the question: Which is this substance called 'I'? Therefore, regarding the question — What is it that is not 'I'? — also that mind decides at different times in different ways; and this predicament has become inevitable for it. Further, especially for the question — "Which is the boundary that separates the two things viz. 'I' and 'the rest'?" — there is no answer at all by the mind. Even so, it is not capable of giving up its obstinacy in believing that the division of 'I' and 'the rest' exists absolutely in the world!

Rarest Archive

In the same manner, if the question — "What are substance (*Dravya*), characteristics (*Guna*), action (*Karma*) ?" — is put, the answer that this mind gives is a queer one. First, it gives the answer : Substance means what is imbued with qualities or characteristics". For example, this mind says that in the substance called a 'lemon', a certain colour, a certain taste, a certain smell — all these are there. But howevermuch we may examine, the colour, the taste and the smell — each one of which is perceptible to one sense organ only — are known alone but the substance called lemon which is the substrate or support for all these qualities or characteristics is never known to us at all. It being so, what evidence is there to say that apart from these characteristics there is a substance ? Someone may ask that because we get the knowledge of the nature — 'That which I had seen before, that thing alone I am touching' — does it not become certain that apart from the characteristics or qualities there must be a substance which is the substrate for them ? But there is not much substance in this argument or contention. For, if it is deliberated in accordance with one's experience, the eyes perceive only the form and the knowledge of anything else is not gained by them; the hands know only the touch and they cannot see anything else. It being so, first the statement itself that by these two we came to know one and the same meaning is not proper; then, where is the question of establishing the existence of the substance on the strength of these twin experiences ? Another consideration : All the qualities like sound (*Shabda*), taste (*Rasa*), smell (*Gandha*) are perceptible to the senses. If there is another substance which is the support or

Rarest Archive

substrate for these qualities, it will mean that that substance will not have any of these qualities of sound, touch, form, taste, smell. In that case, how can we know that substance at all? It will not be perceptible to the senses. To imagine that there should be a substance which is the substrate for the qualities like sound, touch etc. perceptible to the senses, we do not have the support of any experience (*Brihadaarānyaka Bhashya* 4-3-30). Let alone this also. Even if it is accepted that although the substance does not have in itself any of the qualities like sound, touch, form, taste, smell it exists somehow or other by itself, what meaning should we imagine for the statement that — 'That substance is the substrate for the qualities like sound, touch etc.'? It is not possible at all to imagine that, just as pillars are supports for a house or the ground is a support for creatures, that 'substance' is a support carrying the load of these qualities. For, the substance itself does not have or possess any of the following: place, directions, energy etc.; they are all capable of being acquired by it, i.e. the substance, through the qualities. Apart from this imagination what other meaning can ever be imagined for the statement: "Substance is a support or substrate for qualities"? To this objection the intellect or mind cannot imagine or conceive an answer at all. Further, if it is assumed that a substance is endowed with actions also, it will be the same story. Because we do not know the esential nature itself of substance, there is no possibility of the statement — "Action arises in a substance" — having any meaning whatsoever. We have to connote that 'action' means transformation or *Parinaama* (i.e. alteration, change) or *Parispanda* or

Rarest Archive

vibration (or movement). The change that takes place in the constituents or parts of a thing is called *Parinaama* or transformation; the substance having constituents or parts going or moving from one place to another is called *Parispanda* or movement or motion. But to say that apart from the constituents there exists a whole substance, we do not have the support of experience. **Does the whole thing of substance (Avayavi) exist in the parts, or does it exist apart from them i.e. parts, by itself? In the parts or constituents in what form does this whole substance or thing exist?** — If such questions are asked, there is no support at all either of experience or reasoning to explain them. (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-18). That being the case, how will it be proper to say that 'these are the parts or constituents of the substance'? Whenever it is said: "The substance is changing" — what we know or perceive are merely the changes alone and not the substance devoid of change. Therefore, it amounts to saying that there is no basis at all for the belief -- "That substance itself has now undergone a change in this manner". In any case, to the question — "In what manner is the substance a support or substrate for action?" — the mind cannot give a proper answer. Further, **what is the difference between Guna or quality** and action? — if such a question is asked, then also there is no hope of a proper answer forthcoming at all; for, as quality itself keeps on changing, it also has to be included in action only. 'In that case, let everything be action only' — if it is to be argued in this way, then the question — 'In the stream or current of the form of action how did the knowledge that there are changeless substance and quality accrue to

Rarest Archive

us ?' — will go without an answer. If it is to be said that all this is delusion only, what experience do we have as support for this delusion also ? The question — "When nowhere does either changeless substance or changeless quality exist, how did this delusion to the effect — this is a substance, this is quality — also arise ?" — will go without an answer. If it is to be contended that although substance and qualities do not exist it is the nature of the mind to project or show as if they exist only, then another question of the type — "Why should it not be said that although there does not exist any action it is the nature of the mind to show as if it exists only ?" — will crop up ! Thus the consideration of or deliberation on substance, quality and action has become a big 'obstructing wall' standing before the mind.

In the same manner, the phenomenon of the mind struggling without being able to solve the various difficulties arising with regard to **the categories of genus and particular** and with regard to the relationship between substance and quality etc. is in the experience of all of us To wit, to say that the general categories like existence (*Satta*), substantiveness (*Dravyatwa*), quality-ness (*Gunatwa*), action-ness (*Karmatwa*), earth-ness (*Prithveetwa*), water-ness (*Jalatwa*), — etc. have really entered into the external things, what support of experience do we have ? We have the experience that jaggery is sweet and the eatables made by adding jaggery are themselves sweet because of their contact with jaggery. But we have never seen the general category of pot-ness (*Ghatatwa*) existing apart from the pots or it, i.e. potness, having entered the pot

Rarest Archiver

and then having made it appear as a pot. If it is deliberated as to where was the pot-ness before the pot was born ?' there is no possibility of a place being found for it; because only after pot-ness enters a pot it can be called a pot, there is no room to think that it, i.e. pot-ness, was there earlier itself in the pot. Further, especially to say that it (i.e. pot-ness) existed in what was not a pot will be *an extremely contradictory* statement. Similarly, to the question — "Did the pot-ness (*Ghatatwa*) exist in the same place where the pot was born or did it come from somewhere else ?" — also there is no proper answer. For, if it is contended that it existed there only, then the doubt that *'that place should have been* perceived by the people earlier itself as pot' will arise; if it is argued that it came from somewhere else, then it amounts to saying that the category of genus, like the substance, is endowed with action. Yet another question — "Does the category of genus exist wholly in each individual, or does it exist being distributed, part by part, in each individual ? If it wholly exists in one individual, then it cannot manifest itself in another individual; if it is conteded that in all the individuals it exists or distributed, part by part, then it means that it also has parts or constituents and it will become non-eternal. Therefore, it will have to be said that for the knowledge or perception the general categories like pot-ness (*Ghatatwa*), earth-ness (*Prithveethwa*) substantiveness (*Dravyatwa*) etc. existing in the pots, there is no support whatsoever either of experience or logic (reasoning). Even so, *our mind keeps on telling us that* the world is endowed with, or is full of, the forms of genus (or general) and particular (or individual) categories !

Rarest Archive

If the fate of substance, quality and action, on the one hand, and the categories like genus and particular, on the other hand, themselves is like this, what more strength can be attained by the opinion that there is a relationship mutually among these?

Now let us take up the consideration of the question— "**Are the objects like substance, quality, action, genus and particular etc. different from one another or not?**" It is not possible at all for anyone to determine this. For, from the above examination or analytical study it has been established that it is not possible to determine the essential nature of objects like substance, quality, action etc. It being so, how can it be found out whether they are different from one another? Let us here assume merely for the sake of argument, that it is possible indeed to determine the essential nature of things like substance, quality etc. At least then, are we able to find out or reckon what is meant by saying 'different'? Is that thing called 'mutual difference' among the objects - a quality or nature inhering in them or is it their essential nature? In both cases, by the mere perception of the object we should know that it is different from all particular things (in the manner-'such and such an object or thing'). But our experience is not like that. Apart from this, if 'difference' is a quality or nature, the question arises — 'Then is the quality or nature of 'difference' separate or different from the object inhering this nature or quality or not?" If it is not different or apart from it, then there cannot be the category or concept of the nature or quality and the object having or inhering this nature or quality; if it is different or apart, then which

Rarest Archive

is that difference which enables us to know or reckon that the nature or quality and the object inhering or having this nature or quality are separate? Is that difference again the quality or nature of the object or not? — In this manner questions without end will crop up; the differences become endless! In any case, it is evident that there are quite a number of difficulties about the question of 'difference'. Even so, our mind holds on obstinately to the belief that really 'difference' exists in the world.

70. All the names and forms of the indeterminable nature appearing in the waking are truly the Pure Existence alone:

In any case, from the consideration made so far the following fact is established: It is not possible for the waking intellect or mind to enable us to know by determining the essential nature of whatever object that is perceptible to us or of the division that is observed or the difference from their apparent forms. It is true that they appear to exist; it is also true that we have to carry on our day-to-day transactions by assuming that they exist alone. But merely on that account they can never obtain the qualification or authority 'to cut asunder' the Pure or Absolute Existence which is established on the strength of comprehensive or consummate, i.e. Intuitive, experience. The fact that 'our waking intellect, which says that those things exist, is not capable of acquainting us properly with their essential nature' is in itself clarifying to us that there is no stuff or essence in them at all. This

Rarest Archive

being the case, just as the birds and animals are frightened by the form of a man made out of hay, why should we get scared by those apparent forms perceptible to our senses and discard the established philosophical truth that Pure or Absolute Existence is one alone ? If one fact is kept in our mind, all the kinds of fear with regard to this question vanish into thin air That is: In the waking, 'Pure Existence appears to us everywhere; but it exists by Itself without attaching Itself to, or getting involved or tied up with, any waking appearance whatsoever. (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 1-2-12). Realizing this fact, we can get the conviction about the greatness or profundity of the philosophical teaching regarding Pure Existence. For instance: Externally appearing rope-snake, silver of the nacre or shell, the water of the mirage etc. — these phenomena, whenever they appear they appear to indicate in the manner — 'it exists', 'it exists' alone; later on, when they appear in the manner — 'this is not a snake, it is a rope'; 'this is not silver, it is a shell or nacre'; 'this is not water, it is a desert' — the objects like the rope, the shell and the desert also appear to indicate in the manner — 'it exists', 'it exists' only. Similarly, the pot appears to indicate in the manner — 'it exists' only, and later on even when by reasoning it is known or reckoned to be clay, it appears to indicate that 'it exists' in the form of clay alone. In this manner whatever appears, all that appears to indicate — 'it exists' and later on when it is observed penetratively (or on thorough analysis) and it appears as some other object which seems to be like its substrate, it appears in that form to indicate — 'it exists' only. In any

Rarest Archive

case, although objects keep on appearing as 'such and such a thing' with names and forms and keep on changing, it is certain that whatever thing appears that thing appears to indicate in the manner — 'it exists' only. Therefore, it is established that in the waking without the concept of the type of 'it exists' changing, only the names and forms are changing (*Geeta Bhashya* 2-16). If viewed in this manner, it will have to be said that the concept of the type 'it exists' does not belong to the names and forms but it exists by itself independently. If it is said – 'cloth exists', it means 'threads exists'; that in turn means— 'fibres of cotton exist'; that again means 'earth, water, fire, air and space exist' in that order; that in the end means — 'Pure or Absolute Existence' only (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-15). Thus observing the Pure Existence Itself from the viewpoint of the intellect or mind, we are carrying on the transactions of the type — 'It is the (five) elements like space, air etc. as well as the physical objects, substance, quality, action etc. indeed, but if it is viewed from the Absolute standpoint apart from the Pure Existence (i. e Pure Consciousness, the Witness or Self) there does not exist anything else whatsoever. So far we have mainly taken up for consideration the whole objective sphere or world (*Prameya Raashi*) which is perceptible to our knowledge and have proved by reasoning that the names and forms appearing in it are in reality the Pure Existence alone. Even so, it should not be forgotten that this reasoning is applicable to the whole set of instruments of knowledge (*Pramaana Raashi*) which are the means for our perceptive knowledge. If the questions — What are the senses? What is the mind? What is

Rarest Archives

the intellect ?" — are asked, we do not get proper answers; to the question — "In these how did the division as well as the difference among one another come about ?" — also there is no possibility of any answer forthcoming; to the question — "How and wherefrom has the perceptive-ness (*Pramaanatwa*) of the means of perception come ?" — also there is no answer found. Although our mind or intellect has assumed that it knows all these indeed, if each object is separated and any question pertaining to that alone is asked, then it (i.e. mind) without being able to give an exact or a definite answer, keeps on vacillating by giving once the answer — "It is like that" and at another time the answer — "It is not like that, but it is like this." Thus, although we cannot possibly get any sense of certainty regarding the whole range or set of the means of perception (*Pramaana Raashi*) as well as the divisions and the differences seen among them, our mind is proclaiming invariably that all these are existing certainly. As and when we discriminate regarding all these — like the subject (*Pramaatru*), viz. 'I', the means of knowledge (*Pramaana*) of the mind and the senses, and the objects to these, called the perceptible thing or object (*Prameya*) — doubts arise in us endlessly; even so, we have somehow decided (or presumed) with a sense of certainty that all these are names and forms and that in them there is the quality of 'existence' ! Therefore, what is the final judgment ? — **Pure or Absolute Existence Itself is the Ultimate Reality. That Reality appearing divided as names and forms as well as the quality of existence that has entered into those (names and forms) is mere illusion (Maaya), false**

Rarest Archiver

appearance When water is sprinkled on the stone pillars in the Jain temples of Halebid (in Karnataka State, India), in some it flashes as if our body is divided into two parts; similarly, when seen through the outlet of the waking mind or intellect, the Pure or Absolute Existence appears divided into two branches or bifurcations. Just as even when the reflection (of our body) is appearing as two parts in front of us our body remains undivided, in the waking too the undivided Pure Existence (or Pure Consciousness, which is immutable) is observing it in the form of the Witness. **Really, the Witness, the external world and the shadow of Pure Existence that appears in It (as the world) — all are Pure Existence alone.**

(F) The Existence Of The Waking And The Dream Is One Alone

71. The purpose served by comparing waking and dream :

Just as the division appearing in the waking is the handiwork (i.e. projection) of the mind as well as it is illusory, similarly the divisien of waking and dream also is what the waking mind informs us only; that

Rarest Archive

information also is merely an illusory appearance only, but the division of waking and dream is not absolutely true. The mind is 'dividing' the Pure Existence Itself in this manner into two states and is getting itself deluded. Even though to realize that the division or the difference in the form of waking and dream is not absolutely true just remembering the fact that, all this is the sorcery or witchcraft of the waking mind' is enough, there is a special or unique gain in scrutinizing exhaustively or elaborately the all-round resemblance between the waking and the dream. That is : It becomes easy, by means of the comparative examination of these two states, to silence those who think that what we have stated above, viz. that the division as well as the difference appearing in the waking is illusory only — is based merely on the strength of reasoning. If truly observed, we have not followed 'mere reasoning' whatsoever. That mind which says that 'the world and the divisions in it do exist', by examining in the manner that 'world' is appearing to that very mind alone we have determined that this division does not really exist. Especially when observed from the viewpoint of the Intuitive experience of the Witness (i.e. Pure Consciousness, the Self), no division or difference whatsoever is seen at all in the Pure Existence. Therefore, those who argue that Pure Existence cannot be one alone on the strength of the division seen from the waking viewpoint — themselves in reality become pseudo-logicians and people who oppose comprehensive or plenary experience. Even so, for the reason that, in a manner, this our philosophical truth

Rarest Archiver

will gain strength we will now make an attempt to examine or scrutinize more intensively the nature of waking and dream.

72. The three features or characteristics that are there in the waking world exist in the dream world also :

Let us now examine one by one the reasons stated in the previous objections (sub-section 67) to show that dream is of an existence inferior to that of waking or that dream is a mere appearance only. Let us first take up for examination that statement made by the opponent, viz. waking is a state which shows up or projects a world which is established on perceptible evidence, while dream is a state which is the outcome or result of the defect of sleep. In the waking world which is perceptible to our instruments of knowledge (viz. mind and senses) we can see three features. They are : Objects appearing endowed with different names and forms — this is one; the waking world appears to be full of acting agents and enjoyers — this is another; the results or fruits of our actions accruing in accordance with stipulated concepts of time, space and causation — this is the third. (*Sutra Bhashya* 1-1-2). "Because these three characteristics constantly appear in the world without fail and because we have to perforce carry on our day-to-day transactions according to those characteristics alone over which we have no independent control to alter, it has to be said that this world which is a perceptible object does not depend upon us and must be having

Rarest Archive

an existence which is independent by itself. And as the dream appearances are not endowed with such an existence, the dream should be said to be a mere appearance alone — This is the opinion of the opponent.

Is this opinion proper and reasonable ? Can it be reckoned that these characteristics alone are the hall-marks of a real object ? The answer to this question is: In the empirical sphere or day-to-day transactions these may be believed to be the hallmarks of a real thing. For, in the day-to-day transactions (in the workaday world) that object the essential nature of which remains in the same pattern or manner despite, being examined through various means of knowledge that object which everyone is using with the same name and form and that object which is perceived in accordance with stipulated or known (conventional) regulations of time, space and causation — such an object alone is accepted to be 'real' by us. But though there is any amount of utility in the day-to day transactions from this kind of belief, this very basis cannot be adopted in the case of the discrimination about the Ultimate Reality. Because, it is true that the appearances that are perceived in the world are divided into names and forms. Believing in the manner — "We are perceiving many agents of action and enjoyers like me alone, that means, all the human beings who are here in the workaday world are doing certain acts and are obtaining things which they want and are avoiding things which are not wanted by them" — and that alone to be real, we are carrying on our day-to-day transactions,

Rarest Archive

which fact also is true. Further it is true that here in the empirical world only if one performs any act using implements needed for the act in accordance with known conventional regulations about time, space and causation, the fruits or results are obtained. But merely on that account can this world be said to be the Absolute Reality? It is enough if we leave off the waking state which is the stage for the day-to-day transactions and turn our attention towards the dream; immediately it strikes our mind that none of these three characteristics can be a hallmark for Reality. For, while we are dreaming the same characteristics seem to be there for the worlds which are perceived by us therein. To that world of the dream names and forms alone are 'the warp and the woof'. That also, i.e. the dream world, seems to be providing support to many agents of action and enjoyers only. There in the dream also it seems as if for actions the fruits accrue according to the 'known conventional regulations' of time, space and causation. None of us reckon that dream is, like the waking, comprising a real world; even so, the three characteristics mentioned above appear within that 'dream world'. That being the case, what relationship shall we imagine to exist between these characteristics and Reality?

To some people a small doubt may raise its head here: Although the world that exists in the dream may be endowed with names and forms, the latter are not stable names and forms conforming to regulations. There in the dream what is now a house, in another moment it becomes a bird and flies off; what is a

Rarest Archive

mountain becomes water and flows away. There except for the dreamer no other real agent of action or enjoyer exists. Our friends who are in the waking may be away for some time from us and may join us; even then we recognize them. But it is not so in the dream; for that moment some one from somewhere comes and joins the dreamer. Apart from this, there in the dream, known stipulated regulations of time, space and causation do not exist; at any time, at any place and from any cause particular fruits of action may accure. If seen from this standpoint, is not the difference that exists between the real world of the waking and the 'illusory world of the dream' seen more prominently?

This doubt has arisen from the identification with waking viewpoint alone. If dream is seen from the waking viewpoint, there is no possibility for anyone to refute that a difference is seen as stated above; but how do we reckon dream within the dream itself? Then we do not at all reckon or realize that the world that exists therein is a mere illusory world. If the three characteristics — viz. names and forms, manifoldness of agents of action and enjoyers, the fruits of action known to accrue from stipulated time, space and causation concepts — are alone the hall-marks of Reality, then having seen these three hall-marks being absent in the dream why don't we determine there (in the dream) in the manner — "This is an illusory world"? The genuine conclusion is: In the dream the names and forms, the agents of action and enjoyers and the time-space-causation concepts etc.

Rarest Archiver

which appear to us do so as real alone 'at that moment'; believing them to be real only we, in keeping with that belief alone, undertake actions which seem to be suitable. Therefore, it is established that from the reason that these three characteristics exist in it waking does not beget any more or superior existence than the dream.

73. The various concepts about dream and the defects in them :

We can now consider the prima facie statement : 'Waking is a natural state, but dream is a state caused by the defect of sleep'. The opinion that — 'In the waking the appearances are perceptible to our consciousness naturally, but in the dream the appearances are perceived as a result of the latent impressions (*Vaasanas*) of the waking' — is strong and deep-seated in the minds of people. This concept itself is one important cause for the belief that the dream must be having an existence which is somewhat inferior to that of the waking. People belonging to other schools of philosophy have taught doctrines which strengthen this belief alone; the physical scientists too are giving support to this belief alone. We have to take up now the consideration of the question as to how far this opinion is proper or reasonable. Many people have the belief that the nature of a season (*Ritu Sambhaava*), the nature of the food that we have eaten during the day, transactions, thinking etc. become the cause for getting the dream during sleep. The physical scientists say that the changes occurring

Rarest Archives

in the body constitution, the latent impressions caused by the perceptions on the senses, the general inherent qualities in the people of certain families or races, the elations or fears that a particular individual had experienced in the past — all these are the cause for the dream. But even when not getting affected inherently by carrying out any transaction in the waking with excessive inclination of the mind, dreams do occur. Views or scenes which we have never brought up before our mind at all in the waking do appear in the dream. Is this not a hindrance to the concept that the waking is the cause for the dream? It is not possible to give a proper scientific explanation or justification as to why and how a particular impression equal to or identical with time arise in one individual alone and in a particular known dream only.

In the various concepts which the psychologists have formulated regarding this subject-matter also, this kind of objection remains insoluble:

1) In the waking there are some obstacles or impediments which cannot be avoided. Some people say that 'the mother of creation', in order to help the human being to carry on his transactions joyfully and happily avoiding such impediments, causes the dream; but in the dream also many difficult situations are obtained by us. Without being able to avoid the troubles or difficulties there in the dream we are grieving. Because this is established by everyone's

Rarest Archive

experience, to say that 'the state which solves the difficulties of waking alone is the dream' cannot be in accordance with reasoning.

2) Some others are saying that that state which fulfils the desires of the waking or which solves the troubles or griefs of the waking alone is the dream. In this group also the defect mentioned above itself exists; for, there is no dearth of desires or difficulties whatsoever in the world of the dream. Apart from this, in the same matter itself in which one was satisfied in the waking there may appear a difficulty in the dream. For example, one who has been satisfied or content after eating and drinking in the waking when asleep he may dream as if suffering from hunger or thirst.

3) Some others say that that state alone in which the discrepancies or disparities appearing in the waking are rectified or reconciled is the dream For example, some people are poor in the waking and some others rich; if in the dream the poor become rich and the rich become poor, then the disparity or discrepancy that existed in the waking becomes compensated or balanced — this is their opinion. But how can this opinion at all stand unassailed? So many people lament or bewail in the manner — "Alas, even in my dream also my poverty was not removed! Alas, I did not exterminate or vanquish my enemy!"

Rarest Archives

4) Some others entertain the opinion that dream is a state which helps *practise knowledge*. But *anticipating* in the manner — "Because I have to know the objects after getting awakened, let me beforehand learn the method of knowing" — whoever prepares to go to dream ? We do not have any remembrance at all of waking in the dream, then the scenes or appearances perceived in the dream themselves become important to us. Therefore this also is not a concept which is agreeable or consistent.

5) The opinion of some is that dream is a kind of a state which is like stupefaction or perplexed state; but what is the cause for this stupefaction to come and go to everyone and day by day ? From which material is this born, and by which method of redress does it disappear ? To these questions especially there are no answers in this contention.

6) Some others say that : In the dream the stimulating material does not exist completely or fully. Therefore, it is in this respect 'a state of semi-consciousness'. But on which authority or proof they imagine that in the waking the stimulating material exists fully, while in the dream it does not exist — they only know !

In our country some Vedantins say that as fruits for the acts or deeds which the soul or *Jeeva* performs in the waking, *Ishwara* or the Lord creates the

Rarest Archiver

dreams; but their contention, which is put forth by hypothetically positing or postulating *Ishwara* or the Lord with a belief in the authority of the philosophical or scriptural texts and stating the relationship between waking and dream, cannot be examined in the present deliberation which starts keeping in the forefront (or as its spearhead) reasoning based on or supported by Intuitive experience (comprehensive or plenary outlook) alone; hence we have to leave it alone here. **However, this much will have to be stated here that there is no rule or regulation to stipulate that sinners always beget bad dreams only, while righteous or pious people always beget good dreams only.**

It is essential for us to remember that all the various concepts that we have stated or enumerated so far are the outcome of the 'partiality for the waking' only and nothing else. All these protagonists have presumed that waking is an important or pre-eminent state and dreams are caused in subordination to that state and just to fulfil a particular purpose of that state; to determine whether this opinion formed by taking the viewpoint of the waking is proper or wrong, it is enough if one starts to evaluate the waking from the viewpoint of the dream. When we are still in the dream alone, if anyone had said: "There exists another state which is superior to this state, for the benefit of that state this state is obtained" — would anyone of us have agreed ? Never. **In the dream we do not have any 'remembrance' of the waking whatsoever.** If at all we had got the remembrance of this, we

Rarest Archives

would have lowered it to an inferior level than the dream — this is certain; for, to know 'that experience which is perceived at a particular moment to be superior only' is the nature of our mind. For that reason alone, **when we are in the dream we behave therein in the same manner as we would have done if that state were the real waking alone.** We are not prapared to give any value to the conclusion that may be drawn regarding the waking when it is seen from the dream viewpoint; what propriety is there in saying that we must give value or importance only to the conclusion drawn about the dream when seen from the waking viewpoint ?

74. The contention that by examination of the dream the mental diseases can be removed or cured :

Some psychologists have believed that by virtue of the latent impressions of the waking alone the dreams are caused and have begun to analyse the dreams. They have not only found out by experiment that such and such a dream occurs in such and such a manner but also have discovered in this way the diagnostic methods of diseases and are curing through medical treatment. Therefore, those who observe from their viewpoint the belief that there is a close relationship between dreams and waking may become strengthened Hence, it is essential to examine a little more the opinion of these psychologists. They say: "There are two compartments in the mind, viz. the 'chamber of knowledge' and the 'chamber of forgetfulness.' In the waking we experience so many sensations and various feelings of anger,

Rarest Archive

fear, happiness, wonder etc. — don't we? Among these some which belong to the 'chamber of knowledge' remain in memory: all the rest as they are not useful to our present transactions or dealings, we have pushed them away into the 'chamber of forgetfulness.' When they reach there, they mostly shrivel up or shrink in some corner; but some of them, particularly, remain in the vicinity of the door of the outer chamber only, and as soon as any stimulating material or agent is encountered they emerge out. If this stimulating material or agent comes from the external world alone, then it is called waking. If it comes from the inner latent impressions alone it becomes a dream. In this manner because people suppress in the waking desires and feelings or emotions which are strong, those desires and feelings or emotions get transformed or metamorphosed and appear in the dream. If such desires and feelings or emotions which are the causes for dreams are properly discovered by analysis, it amounts to examining not only man's exterior but also his interior. Then the successful medical treatment or therapeutics of man's mental diseases can be carried out" — This is the opinion of these psychologists. In this opinion it is quite clear that it has been acknowledged that there is close relationship between waking and dreams and that dream is not an independent state.

Although the concept which is described here above may all at once seem to conform to reason and experience, it is not a structure which can withstand the onslaught of discrimination. For, first of all imagining or conceiving two compartments in the mind is itself not in keeping with reasoning; even if it is agreed that

Rarest Archive

somehow these two parts are there in it, no one is there who has seen either the waking experiences and emotions or feelings going into the interior chamber and hiding there or some only among them rushing out having been stimulated by an external material. Apart from this, the 'sick person' should state the experience of his dream and the 'doctor' should understand its meaning or significance. Is it not a fact that on these two supports alone the examination of the mind (of the patient) proceeds? Here first of all we have to determine whether the patient has the capability of describing the dream. Who knows whether he has stated about the dream 'as it is or not'? Besides, can it be said that the doctor too is capable of properly understanding the meaning or significance of the dream mentioned by the patient? Is it possible for him (i.e. the doctor) to find out the nature of the patient's mind at all? This also gives room for doubt only. People get so many types of dreams, but can it be said that all of them are caused by diseases only or are caused as a result alone of the 'suppressed desires and feelings or emotions'? Apart from this, does one person remember all the dreams that occur to him? Even if he does, among the hundreds of multifarious dreams, which dream shall we select and say— "This alone is the dream wanted to indicate or signify the patient's feelings or emotions and experiences'? If all these things are realized, it appears that it is impossible only for anyone to understand the meaning or significance of a dream. The medicine that is prescribed based on the dream is a kind of medicine of faith or belief; it may be said that that is also

Rarest Archive

akin to a charm or spell, an amulet or talisman, witchcraft etc. Yet another point: In this world dreams do not occur only to sick persons; dream is a phenomenon which is a common experience that occurs to all healthy persons. Dreams occur to everyone, whether it be women or men, old people or boys, poor people or rich or wealthy people, the righteous or the unrighteous, moderate eaters or gluttons, teetotallers or drunkards, the wise or the dullheads, poets or scientists, ascetics or the coveted or greedy, devotees of God or sceptics. All these people get all kinds of dreams. If there were a natural law or rule that such and such a person gets such and such a dream, then by assuming that dreams are related to the waking experiences we could as well have attempted to determine the condition of the waking mind by studying the nature of the dreams. But there is no such natural law existent at all. Therefore, it has to be said that by this kind of examination or analysis of the mind no help is rendered in finding out or discovering the secrets whatsoever of life However-much the doctor might have obtained success with the aid of this compartmentalization or division of the mind, it can never gain the honourable status of being called a 'scientific method'. Even in case it gains, to the present deliberation of the three states which we are making there cannot be even an iota of threat from that quarter For, the defect that the 'partitioners of the mind' too are seeing the dream from the waking viewpoint alone keeps shadowing them. Apart from this, there is another defect in their opinion or concept, viz. they are building the edifice of their science first imagining the existence of others'

Rarest Archive

minds and states without having examined their own minds and states of waking and dream and then relying on that imagination.

75. The unjustifiable concepts in the theory that dream occurs because of the latent impressions of the waking :

Now in another manner all the theories mentioned above may be examined : All those who have begun to show that dream is an inferior existence imagining a relationship between waking and dream are saying that dream occurs because of the defect of sleep and that as a result of the latent impressions of the waking alone the experience of various visions occur in the dream. But for this statement what authority or support of an experience is there ? Deep sleep means a state in which there is no external experience whatsoever of any kind, while dream means a state in which some unknown external scenes or visions are perceptible to our knowledge or consciousness. This being the case, which reasoning can provide support at all to say that during the time of the dream, deep sleep also co—exists ? Because the statement that 'without going to sleep we do not get dream' is in accordance with experience, we can accept that at least. But how can we agree to the statement that at one and the same time we are also sleeping (meaning, we are not seeing anything at all) as well as seeing the dream also ? Is this not a contradictory statement ? In deep sleep the knowledge as well as the memory of the body, the senses and

Rarest Archive

the external objects of the waking world— all of them are erased. Hence, **it becomes certain that no object whatsoever of the waking state can cross over deep sleep and squeeze itself into the dream.** This being the case, how much can it be in keeping with propriety or justice to say that only the mind which is tied down with the waking world has somehow escaped therefrom and has entered the dream and by its latent impressions the dream occurs ? Both in the waking and in the dream we are getting the knowledge of objects equally only. Even so, we think that in the waking the objects exist outside but in the dream especially the objects do not exist outside. We think that in the waking the light that comes from the external object touches our eyes and their knowledge is gained, but in the dream, particularly, the latent impressions of the waking that are lurking in us alone manifest themselves and appear as the knowledge of the objects. How can this 'partiality' be reasonable ? **If in the dream the mind alone without desiderating any external material can create everything, what justification or support is there to believe that the mind cannot similarly create everything in the waking ?**

So far we have been arguing having accepted that by virtue of the latent impressions alone the outside objects become perceptible after getting transformed. But how is the real situation or state of affairs ? In the waking we have never seen even a single object having born outside from any latent impression. However strong may be the latent impression in our mind, it cannot create even a straw. Despite this being so, to say that 'an entire world

Rarest Archive

that appears in the dream is itself caused by the latent impression of the waking' — if this is not equal to the statement that 'a barren woman delivered hundreds of children', what else is it ?

76. Dream and waking — both these are real, if not both are false; really both are identical :

In the waking we utilize real things and obtain real benefits, while in the dream everything is mere appearance only. In the waking we mingle with many people and carry on transactions, while dreams are occurring to each individual differently. Therefore, it is to be said that the waking world and its objects are existing independently and that they alone are real, while in the dream, particularly, merely the latent impressions of the mind alone did appear in that manner. It is true, however, that in the waking the latent impressions getting transformed into objects is not in one's experience; but in delirium don't the multifarious visions, which have become the transformations of the latent impressions, appear ? Similarly, what is wrong if it is said that in the dream also the latent impressions get transformed and appear like objects ? Apart from this, let us assume that we are not able to say as to how the latent impressions themselves got transformed and appeared like objects; even so, their occurrence in the dream, and soon after getting awake, all those appearances disappearing — these are in our experience. Therefore, 'all the appearances of the dream are caused for the time being from latent impressions' — in this manner,

Rarest Archive

reconciling it with one's experience, why can't we say? — Like this a doubt may crop up.

But, for this doubt the foundation is not strong. For, what justification or reason is there to say that in the waking we utilize real objects? (1) Is it that — 'they are established on the strength of the means of valid knowledge'? Just as we are perceiving the objects with our senses and they seem to be existing really, in the dream also it appears in the same manner. We have previously (sub-section 72) explained in detail that the objects which appear to us in the dream look just like the objects which we deem in the waking to be 'certified' by the right means of knowledge. (2) Shall we say that the fact that 'we get an inclination to advance towards objects which we are utilizing in the waking because of their effective or efficient nature' vouches for their reality? That is also not possible. For, just as in the waking when we bathe in a tank our clothes get wet in the same manner in the dream also (when we bathe in a tank) our clothes get wet only. Just as in the waking when we eat we get satiated, it happens in the same way in the dream too. Just as we get liking or hatred, inclination towards procurement or avoidance, elation, grief or fear etc. towards the waking objects, in the same manner in the dream too these are caused. It is true that on certain occasions in the dream it appears as though the relation between the action and its fruits is not according to laid-down regulations; but this judgment we pass only after we become awake and during the time of the dream we do not come to know at all that the regulations were

Rarest Archives

vitiated. (3) Further, if it is contended that — "In the waking we are carrying on transactions with many people!" — then in the dream too we invariably get the experience as though at that moment we are carrying on transactions with so many people If it is doubted — "The objects or the benefits accruing to us from them or the people who were carrying on transactions with us in the dream — when we become awake — none of these exist really, is it not?" — then the objects which appear to us in the waking or the benefit accruing from them or the people who were carrying on transactions do not enter into the dream at all. Therefore, "the appearances in the dream becoming falsified or unreal is caused by the viewpoint of the waking knowledge alone. Similarly, the waking appearances or visions also becoming unreal or falsified is caused by the viewpoint of the dream knowledge alone, but they are not unreal by themselves" — (*Chaandogya Bhashya* 8-5-4). **Till we Intuit the Ultimate Reality both the states, i.e. waking and dream, during their respective times are real in their own forms only; after we Intuitively know (the Ultimate Reality) both are real alone in the form of Pure Existence.** In this regard it is not possible to mention any difference whatsoever between those two states

77. The nature of time that appears in waking and dream :

"The world that appears in the waking is the same in the past, in the present and always, but the worlds of the dream are different every day! Is it

Rarest Archiver

not ?" — This objection also can be solved by the above reasoning alone. For, the fact that the dream world appears differently seems to be true only when seen from the waking viewpoint. But how does it appear in the dream ? Do we understand at that moment in any manner like — "Just now a world getting ready has come and stood before me" ? No. The notion that — 'this world exists like this always' — alone is impregnated in us. To the objection that — 'that dream world does not appear now, is it not ?' — the solution lies in the pointer — 'this waking world or its sway does not exist at all in the dream' — alone.

But if the **time notion** that appears to us in the waking and the dream is analysed a bit more, not only will the fact that — 'even the belief of the eternal existence of the waking world is not at all its special feature' — be clear but also the fact that — 'the waking and the dream are completely independent states alone and that they are not related to each other'.... becomes all the more evident. Therefore, we will undertake this task. **Regarding the question as to what is meant by 'time' there is difference of opinion between the ancients and the modern people.** Some philosophers of our country were saying that there is no entity like time at all and that it is a different form of space alone. The logicians were saying that when the objects are perceived with the aid of the external lights like the sun, the moon etc., the adjunct that we utilize to measure the change in that perception is itself 'time'. Among the Western schools of philosophy also of late various types of dialectics about this

Rarest Archive

topic have emerged. Some say that time is merely a mental concept; it is a conceptual category necessary for discrimination or reasoning; some say that apart from the time that is relative to an individual there is also an 'elemental time'; some say that there are two kinds of time, viz. relative time and absolute time; some say that there is a fourth dimensional category of an entity which is a combination of time and space — In all such ways they have variously opined. But to us the question as to which of these opinions or concepts is the real one is not relevant. **Particularly it is true that everyone of us has a 'concept of time'. It does not exist only in the waking, but it exists in the dream too.** We should not forget this fact.

Let us analyse a little and see what things are hidden in the 'concept of time'. Without the appearance of objects or things outside or without any concepts or thoughts in the mind time does not exist; neither can the objects nor the concepts themselves exist without time. The phenomenon of the objects appearing to us as undergoing various changes — the mind which causes the opinion of the type — "In the past the objects were like this, now they are like this, in the future they will become such and such" — is caused by time alone. In the present time we transact with the perceptible objects in their totality as — 'they exist'; regarding some objects which we remember as having existed in the past time we transact as — 'they have gone away, they do not exist now' — and regarding some other objects we transact as — 'they existed then also, even now they are existing as they were or they exist with some differences';

Rarest Archives

in the future time among those objects which can be perceived, regarding some we transact as — 'existing now, they will exist then also' — and regarding some others we transact as — 'not existing now, they will come into being or existence then'. Having believed that in all these transactions 'time' is continuously 'flowing', we have even conceived of means of knowing it by units of measurement like day, night, hour and minute etc. Even so, when a particular desirable experience disappears we feel as if that experience disappeared very quickly and an undesirable experience, even while it exists, or when we are anticipating a desirable experience to be gained in future, we feel as if time is being spent very slowly. All these are the aspects or features which are hidden or implicit in the 'time concept'.

If we compare the time concepts that appear to us in the waking and the dream, both of them appear to be of the same nature. In both these 'times' — features like — the present experience, the past memory and the future anticipation or expectation — all these exist in common. The flux or current of time is flowing according to the respective circumstances only. By the waking standard the dream time appears to be small; but in the dream it did not appear in the least as small. We never felt at all therein (i.e. while in the dream) in the manner — "For this event there is not enough time." Some people opine that the 'dream time' is hidden or concealed within the 'waking time' and we should imagine a relationship between these two kinds or categories of time in the manner of staging a drama

Rarest Archive

within another drama (just as in the drama — *'Jaanaki Parinaya'*). **But unless we assume that the dream occurs within the waking we cannot say that in this waking time that dream time exists. These two time series are restricted or tied down to their respective states alone;** the visions or scenes of a particular state are tied down or confined to the respective state alone They cannot at all exist one without the other. This is the real state of affairs.

Let us now consider the question — "whether the statement that — 'the waking world is always the same and the dream world is not like that' — is in accordance with the real state of affairs or not?" When we conceive or think that the waking world is 'always' the same, which is this concept of time of 'always'? It is the waking time indeed. Did this appear in dream? No. Similarly, is it not" reasonable to ask the question — "Does the dream world appear to be the same 'always in the dream time or not?" To this reasonable question there is only one answer: We have the feeling in the dream time that that dream world is one and the same only But when we say that the dreams occur 'each day' and in a different manner, the each day' that we talk about, to which flux or current of time does it belong? Is it not the waking time alone? In that case, is it proper to object or argue that the dream world is not restricted or tied down to the waking time? Just as the waking world does not appear in the 'dream current of time', in the same manner the dream world does not appear in the 'waking flux of time'; there is no wonder in this at all. Therefore, there is no superiority or greatness

Rarest Archives

whatsoever accruing to the waking world from 'time'. That waking world is related to its respective time, that is all. In the same manner, because the dream world also is related to that state it will have to be said that in that dream world there is no defect or problem whatsoever in this regard.

78. The space and causation concepts that appear in the waking and the dream also exist independently :

The methods of resoning mentioned above should, also be made applicable to the concepts of 'space' and 'causation' of the waking and the dream also. **For, just as the flux or flow of time is different alone for these two states, in the same manner the concepts of space and causation also are different alone.** Just as there is not one and the same common time for both the waking and the dream, there is no common space or no common causation or cause–effect regulation too. Those particular space and causation are tied down to their respective state alone. In any case, **there is no mutual relationship whatsoever between the categories of time, space, causation of these two states.** A partial paralysis patient who is asleep on the upper storey of his house in Mysore on the night of the New Moon Day (*Amaavaasya*) may dream as if he is swimming in order to keep himself alive in the ocean of '*Shaanti*' against the onslaught of the waves in the scorching afternoon sun. It being so, what relationship can be imagined to exist among the objects appearing in these two states ? **It is also in the experience of everyone of us that the body, the senses, the mind, the**

Rarest Archives

intellect and the ego that are appearing in these two states are mutually quite queer. A one-eyed lame Brahmin mendicant, with the stub of an arm, who is asleep having curled himself up in a dilapidated temple, after begging from house to house for alms during the day may see a dream in which he, a courageous emperor, wins against his enemies in a war by wrestling, climbs up the royal elephant, accepts the warm reception of his subordinate kings and is entering the capital. Thus between the body, the senses etc. of these two kinds with extremely queer characteristics what relationship can be imagined? Can it be said that these two are the events happening at the same time and to one individual? To those who say that dream is a refinement or transformation of waking all the descriptions mentioned above are hindrances. For, if the mind in both the states is the same, then the refinement or transformation can be imagined. To say that in the past an experience was gained and then as a result of refinement or transformation another experience was gained also, the flow of time has perforce to be one and the same. But there is no time that is common to both the waking and the dream. Neither both of them are existing in one space; in each of them different modes of time and space exist. It being so, where can there be any cause-effect relationship between these states? If that is not there, on what ground or basis can the argument that 'dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking' be sustained?

Rarest Archive

79. Defect in the opinion that in the waking time dreams occur :

In the objection — "In one night alone dreams without number may occur; among them no one dream occurs like the other" — in view of the details mentioned above, it is established that there is no stuff at all. For, what we understand by the phrase - in one night alone' — that belongs to the waking time. But by the deliberation that we have made so far it is decided that there is no relationship whatsoever between the waking time and the dream. Therefore, though our saying — "I slept for one hour and got up ; during that time I had two or three different dreams" — may be said to be proper from the viewpoint of the waking transactions, it is not proper from the viewpoint of deciding the Reality. For, in the waking time the dream never occurs at all. It being so, it amounts to saying that the statement that in one night dreams without number occur' has no meaning at all. In the same manner, the objections of the type — "In a quarter-of-an-hour's sleep I dreamt as having transacted for 50 years ! On the tip of a needle thousands of fighters appeared to stand and fight ! Howevermuch I ate there I did not get satiated ! How can the dream be true ?" — also must be understood to crop up from the defect of 'adhibiting' or sticking the waking time-space-causation categories to the dream. In this manner, if the waking eye which sees the dream is shut and the dream is seen from the dream viewpoint alone — look how it appears : If any particular dream among dreams that occur without number is chosen and examined, that

Rarest Archive

will be equal to waking alone. Without taking into the reckoning even the least of the waking time-space etc. or the waking events or the waking itself, our feelings and transactions are carried on there (i. e. in the dream). Therefore, whichever dream it may be, it does not occur in the waking time at all; therefore, it is not possible to measure the dreams in the manner — 'Dreams occurred in so much time' — with the waking standard of time. **In reality, dream and waking – both these are independent states alone.**

80. The whole of dream for the time being, i.e. during its occurrence, appears to be 'waking' alone :

Now at the end of this examination one more objection remains to be solved : "After waking up from a dream we have a knowledge in the manner— 'What I saw till now was a dream, not true.' But in which other state does the waking get falsified ? The whole of the dream is falsified, whereas the waking is never falsified at all. In the ultimate analysis, does this difference at least remain valid or not ?" In this objection the fact that the distinction of the type — That which is falsified is illusory and that which is not falsified is real' — has been assumed is clear. Howevermuch utility there may be to logic by this distinction, but by assuming this difference it is not at all going to help us in determining what Reality is. For, all that appears to us during delusion seems to be true only at that moment. Therefore, by this assumption it did not amount to our finding any special feature or characteristic whatsoever to help determine the question — 'Whether a particular vision or

Rarest Archiver

scene which we have believed to be true is true or whether it is a mere appearance?' In the present context, the regulation — viz. 'that which is falsified is dream, that which is not falsified is waking' — is mentioned, is it not? By using this regulation it is not possible at all to cognize in the manner — 'such and such is a dream'. For, when dream occurs we do not at all have the knowledge in the manner — "This is going to be falsified in the future, hence it is a dream". In that state always the knowledge of the type — "This is waking alone" — is obtained. Thus when the whole of the state that is in one's experience appears to be waking alone and real only, of what use is the regulation — 'that which gets falsified is dream?'

There is a certain experience which gives a greater support to what we have stated so far. That we will now bring home to the readers. As stated above, every dream that occurs to us, at that moment appears to be waking alone, is it not? Therefore, the time that exists therein is divided, just as the waking time only, into 'past', 'future', 'now, at present'. There being many 'wakings' in the past and in the future, it appears as if all of them are related to that waking alone. Not only that, besides occurring to us as if there are many 'dreams' — inferior to that waking — having been experienced before that 'waking state', it also appears as if that none of those 'dreams' was like any other whatsoever. We believe at that time also (i.e. within the first dream) that 'the waking states, only are always of one and the same form. Assume that, when you were in one particular dream among

Rarest Archives

such dreams, you had started discussing the present topic with any one person; then, assume also that the other person argued that there is no difference whatsoever between dream and waking. At that moment with what belief or feeling regarding that dream which was appearing to you as waking were you arguing? Would you not have persisted arguing at that moment also that that dream was really 'waking' alone and that state was superior in all respects to the state which you had reckoned to be a 'dream'? Would you have evaluated the 'dream' which you had then reckoned as waking, i.e. the first dream, even an iota less than the state which you have now really believed or conceived as waking? Never. Would you not have endeavoured to establish, just as it is being done at present, then also (in that first dream) the difference between the dream with which you had identification (or towards which you have pronounced proclivity) as waking alone and the 'dreams', which you had conceived therein, as dreams only of inferior value or worth? If you were to examine dispassionately your experience and then answer, you will invariably agree to all this stated above with an affirmative 'yes' only. Therefore, the conclusion on the whole is: When the dream occurs or appears to us, it appears to be true just as the waking alone; then we may see within it (i.e. the first dream) another dream which has occurred and gone. In that circumstance, really there is no particular fixed or cognizable flux or flow of time common to the dream which we have reckoned as waking and that inner dream which we have conceived as dream; our conception then that those states have come and gone one after another in one line or series of time is mere delusion alone. In the same manner, there is no

Rarest Archive

particular flow of time at all which interlinks the state which we now know to be waking and the states which we have conceived as dreams; therefore, it is established that to say either the waking occurs after the dream or the dream occurs after the waking is only a delusion caused by the identification with the waking and nothing else whatsoever.

81. Conclusion of the comparison between waking and dream :

If the whole gamut of deliberation made so far is condensed into one sentence and stated, it will be : **The state which we can cognize or reckon in the manner — 'This is waking' — does not exist at all; for, every state in which there exists the knowledge of a second entity (in other words, knowledge of duality) when it is being experienced it strikes or flashes as if it is waking alone.** Looking from the viewpoint of 'a state being conceived as waking alone' we think that there is a dream inferior to it. But we do have the remembrance too of the fact that the other state, which we call dream, also flashed or appeared as being waking alone which had retained in its womb another dream. Thus these two, viz waking and dream, are relative concepts alone and not that the division 'of waking and dream does exist independently in truth. In this manner in both the states which flash to our mind (i.e. which we Intuit) the external physical world and corporeally those which are seeing the world, viz. our body, mind, vital force, intellect and ego — all these are appearing 'independently' alone. Just as the body, the mind etc. which

Rarest Archives

exist in one state, we can see the body, the mind etc. in the other state also. But either between the bodies and the minds etc. of the two states or between the objects of the two worlds appearing within those states there does not exist any relationship whatsoever. Time, space and causation etc. — these also are existing independently alone in each state In both these two states our transactions. and likes, dislikes, elation, grief etc. which are caused by them exist in common. In both states, like us only there exist many other people and appear to be carrying on transactions with us. In both the states we have concepts of certitude (or a sense of certainty). As regards the state which we conceive to be a dream in relation to that original state, we get a 'feeling' of the existence of characteristics like uncertainty, variety and mutually being queer etc. In both these two states we feel as if the state we reckon as 'waking' occurs in common to many people and only the deep sleep and dream states occur individually to each one of us. In any case, it is not possible at all to conceive of any difference between the essential natures of these two states.

The notion that between these two states the dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking is common to all people. For this notion the identification with or affinity for the waking alone is the cause and nothing else. Seen from one point of view, just as there appear to be reasons to believe that the effect of the waking is caused on the dream, there are also means to believe that the effect of the dream is caused on the waking as well. For example, the effect of experiences or sensations like happiness

Rarest Archives

and fear etc. born out of some visions or scenes which we have seen in the dream is caused in the waking too. The person who has seen a tiger in his dream becomes afraid and screaming wildly wakes up; even after waking up, as a result of that fear, he is likely to get temperature. There are also persons who really meet in their waking holy persons whom they had seen in their dreams and obtain their grace. It is in the experience of some of us that the events which were seen in the dream as having really occurred in the waking. There are some persons too who find out in their dreams answers to problems of the waking which seemed to be knotty or complicated and have experienced their fruits in the waking. There are also instances of two persons dreaming as if having seen each other in their respective dreams and after waking up each saying: "I saw you in my dream". For all these reasons it can be said that the effect of the dream also is caused on the waking. But all this is the outcome of the dry logic used on the assumption not only of the dream and the waking being endowed with different characteristics but also of the fact that latent impressions can attain the forms of external objects. The fact that dream and waking are both similar 'types of states' has been so far clarified by us; the fact that no latent impression whatsoever can attain the form of an external object also has been established by us on the strength of universal experience. Therefore, the real philosophical teaching is that the dream does not cause any effect on the waking; the waking also does not cause any effect on the dream. The fact that 'these two states mutually change each other' is a mere delusion alone is immediately realized if the experience of a dream occurring within a

Rarest Archive

dream is discerned by the mind. For, there (in the dream) also the inner dream and the outer dream which seems to have concealed the former within itself appear to be mutually causing effect on each other; it appears that between them one is a dream and the other is waking. Even so, it is clear that all that is delusion only. In order to realize that there is no kind of relationship whatsoever between the dream and the waking one should keep in mind, as we have stated above, the fact that there is neither the time nor the space at all which connect both of them Just as there is no relationship at all between the dream which appears as if it is waking and the dream which flashes within the former as a dream, similarly between the state which we have now conceived as the waking and the state which is appearing to us to be within it as a dream there is no relationship at all. Between the snake and a stream of water which are seen through delusion in a rope there is no relationship whatsoever. When one of them appears, the other does not appear. In reality, both of them do not exist at all in their own forms. Similarly, in the case of waking and dream also it should be understood that they do not exist at all in their own forms. If seen from the empirical point of view, it is not false at all that the states of waking and dream occur to us. **Just as we really experience the waking, in the same manner we experience the dream also 'really' only. In this sense, both these are real, one as much as the other.** With regard to either the waking or the dream, there does not exist any extra-ordinary characteristic. It is not possible at all to say that one is superior and the other is inferior. But it is

Rarest Archive

not possible to say from the absolute or transcendental viewpoint that they are real.

Some people accept that the dream is as much real as the waking. What they say is: Let it be if the dream is not of an inferior grade compared to the waking; but what hurdle or hindrance is there to say that both these two states exist really in their respective forms? Why should it not be assumed that they exist really in their respective forms? Many wakings occur to us; similarly, many dreams also occur. In each one of these two kinds of states there exists a separate world; why should it not be said that all these worlds really exist in the states of their respective levels? These worlds may not go from one state to another; therefore, you may even say that these belong to different species. But how can it be said that they are not real at all and that 'existence' of all of them is one and the same?

People who ask in all these ways have not deliberated upon what is meant by Reality. The readers must remember what we have previously (sub - section 54) discussed about this topic. Is it possible to reckon that either the world, which is confined to its respective state, or the state, which is said to exist only during the time of its respective appearance, is fit to attain the existence of the Witness (*Saakshi or the Self*), who witnesses it and exists independently without depending upon or being under the obligation of any time, space or causation whatsoever? Never it is possible. Therefore, the waking

Rarest Archive

and the dream are not absolutely real in the forms they appear to be ; they do not at all have any existence other than the Pure Existence (or Pure Consciousness) of the Witness which illumines them. That they exist by themselves is false. That they in those forms, i. e. as states, have either any temporal or spatial relationship is false alone ; that they, by virtue of the cause-effect concept, are caused one by the other is also false only. In the forms of their appearance, between them none is having a higher value than the other ; in the natures of their existence between them none is separate from the existence of the Witness (*i.e. Atman or the Self*). As already stated, because the Witness is Pure Existence alone, that Itself is the waking and the dream ; they are really the Pure Existence alone; Pure Existence alone is their Absolute Reality or Being. Therefore, there is no objection whatsoever against the philosophical teaching or truth, viz. "Pure Existence alone is (*or has become*) everything".

(G) The Nature Of Pure Existence

82: The misconceptions that common people have regarding deep sleep :

We will conclude this Chapter by gathering or collecting together the various facts that have been established in the matter of the Pure Existence by the

Rarest Archive

deliberation or analysis that we have carried out so far. For this task, as the most important one we will take the experience of deep sleep alone as the basis or foundation. First of all, we should consider the question "What is meant by deep sleep ?" It can be stated with a sense of plenitude or abundance that among the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep, the magnitude of the misconception that is caused regarding the third one, i. e. deep sleep, is not caused with regard to the remaining two; even if it is stated — 'If the essential nature of that state is fully discerned or Intuitively examined, then it amounts to possessing all the secrets or hidden truths about the Absolute Reality' — that will not be an exaggeration. People are experiencing deep sleep every day, but they do not deliberate at all upon its essential nature even the least bit. It appears as if many people have assumed that deep sleep means a kind of non-existence alone. For, if anyone is asked — 'What is meant by sleep ?' — he will answer in the manner :

1) "That state which exists without any sensory knowledge, without any mental reasoning alone is sleep ; therein there exist no kinds of happiness or grief, no likes or dislikes, no mode of transaction whatsoever." But merely saying that in deep sleep there exists nothing whatsoever, is its description completed or fully scanned ? Should not one discern at all as to what kind of a state it is? If deep sleep were a mere non-existence where the senses or the means of knowledge were not functioning, if in it there were no benefit whatsoever accruing which

Rarest Archiver

could be stipulated in the form of injunctions, then why is it that every creature is daily hankering after it ?

2) We are believing generally that when we are asleep we are lying in a particular corner of the world and although we are lying like that without the knowledge of the world outside us, that world in and by itself, being confined to the regulations of time, space and causation, is constantly changing. But is the world capable of existing by itself ? we have previously (sub-section 27) made it clear that the world which appears in our waking is confined to that state alone and that the statement made to the effect that ' even when we are not awake that world exists as it is ' has no meaning at all. Apart from this, when we assume or reckon that outside the deep sleep state there exists the world, does it not amount to our conceiving that deep sleep means either a ' room or compartment ' or any other particular region with limitations or boundaries ? Deep sleep is an experience only and not a substance or matter which can exist in time and space. Even so, we are conceiving of an 'outside' and an 'inside' to that state— is this not wrong ?

3) From the empirical viewpoint it is proper only to say : "While I am asleep another person may be awake, and he may say so when I wake up ; therefore, the world must exist during the time of our deep sleep." But for determining the Ultimate Reality how can this view-piont be helpful ? 'I', another person-all are belonging to the waking world. From the viewpiont of the waking, to say like-'I', 'you', 'another'-is proper; but when seen from the viewpoint of deep sleep (experience), where does this 'I' exist or 'you' exist ?

Rarest Archive

4. Anyone may doubt: 'When we wake up, we see the same world. But when we get up from deep sleep and are seeing a world outside us, how to determine whether we are awake or seeing a dream? We must again remember here what has been decided in the previous section, viz. there is no difference whatsoever between waking and dream. In the dream we get the illusion that always we see the same world; but there is no acceptance by anyone at all of the statement: 'That alone is true'. Why this partiality with regard to the waking world alone? Why should not the notion — 'Here (in the waking) we saw the same world'— be a delusion just as in the dream? Therefore, the belief that outside the deep sleep there exists a world is not helpful in the determination of the Ultimate Reality; hence, the opinion that we remain in one part of the world and are asleep is not logically pure and blemishless. In the same way —

5) The opinion that — "In order to overcome the exhaustion that we had obtained in our waking the state in which we get rest or relaxation is itself deep sleep"— also is not proper. For, the notion that the body, the senses etc. which had got exhausted by doing work in the waking exist in deep sleep also is subsumed in the belief that — 'the waking world exists in deep sleep only' — and hence this is also contradictory logically, just like the former argument.

Keeping all this in mind if we deliberate or ratiocinate, the decision that emerges is this much:

Rarest Archive

Because we see the essential nature of deep sleep either from the waking or the dream viewpoint it appears as of a nature of non-existence. In reality, deep sleep is not merely the non-existence of either the dream or the waking; neither is it a state in which the senses and the mind remain quiescent without functioning. It is also wrong to say that the world exists outside deep sleep. All these are the wrong beliefs or misconceptions that we have formed regarding deep sleep from the waking view-point.

83. Deep sleep means Pure Existence:

In that case, the question — 'What is really the essential nature of deep sleep?'— looms large before us. In reality, it is not a 'state' at all. For, if we are to assume the meaning of a 'state' as a special feature caused by time, then deep sleep does not become a state. For, we do not have experience of any time whatsoever in deep sleep. On the other hand, we can also adduce another meaning of — 'It is a manner of appearance of the Ultimate Reality'— to the word 'state', is it not? (sub-section 39). From that viewpoint also deep sleep does not become a state. For, in deep sleep nothing whatsoever appears at all. If it is said — 'In that case, does deep sleep mean pure essenceless-ness?'— it is not so. For, therein we exist; because the Witness (*Saakshi*) which is our essential nature of Being (i e. Pure Existence) exists therein alone, it has become possible for us now (in the waking) to deliberate with regard to deep sleep as well as communicate about it to others. It is possible for anyone to doubt in the manner-"If I exist in deep sleep, why is it not known

Rarest Archive

as 'I' ?" For, in deep sleep 'I'-notion does not exist in the form of 'I'. The notion of 'I' desiderates the relationship of 'you', 'he', 'another'. In deep sleep there is no scope whatsoevet for the divisions and differences of the type of 'I', 'you', 'he' to exist. For the divisions and differences to exist the time and the space categories or concepts alone are the cause; but in deep sleep neither time nor space exists at all. **When we know by means of the non-intellectual or absolute Intuitive experience both the waking as well as the dream in their totality as one lump, we do so in the form of the Witness; in that same form alone we Intuit deep sleep also.** If properly observed, to say that 'we know deep sleep' also becomes a misconception alone. For, therein there does not exist anything whatsoever as an object to know— (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-3-23). Even our statement — "There nothing whatsoever existed; this is my experience" — is one made by comparing the experience of duality that occurs to us in the waking. In reality, there (i. e. in deep sleep) because there was no object whatsoever, there was no subject too. Even the statement — "In other states our *Atman* or Self who is the Witness for the *Anaatman* or not - Self which is different from Him is a Witness to the non-existence of any *Anaatman* or not - Self whatsoever therein (i. e. in deep sleep)" — is also made in a secondary sense only, and it is also tarnished by the waking viewpoint. Just as we conceive that a lamp illumines objects in front of it as also it illumines their non-existence, similarly in one sense we can conceive that in deep sleep *Atman* or the Self also is a Witness to the non-existence of anything whatsoever. If observed from the deep sleep viewpoint, it is not possible at all to say that *Atman*

Rarest Archive

witnesses or sees there in deep sleep any existing object or non-existing object; for, there is no scope at all there either for anything to exist or not to exist in any manner. Therefore, then the Witness (*Saakshi Chaitanya* or Pure Consciousness) is not a Witness at all; He is Pure Existence — Pure Consciousness. , Hence, whether it is said 'deep sleep' or Pure Existence, it is all one and the same. This alone is the philosophical teaching that remains valid till the end.

84. In Pure Existence there are no divisions like manifested and unmanifested, mutable and immutable :

Now to the question as to what happens to the whole world in deep sleep an answer can easily be given. As the phenomenon of the world is confined to its own respective state, it does not exist at all either inside or outside deep sleep; just as there is no taint of time in deep sleep, similarly there is no taint of space also; hence, there are no inside and outside to deep sleep. This we have already explained. Thus deep sleep means Pure Existence alone and it becomes established that therein no other thing whatsoever exists at all. Even the statement of the Shruti or the scriptural texts (*Upanishads*) that — 'In deep sleep the world merges in Pure Existence' — is only a statement made from the empirical viewpoint alone; for, we have clarified that the phenomenon of the world is Pure Existence alone and that apart from Pure Existence the world does not exist at all. Because the universe itself is a conglomeration of time-space-causation categories, if it is said either that the

Rarest Archive

world as a whole goes somewhere or that it comes from somewhere it conveys no meaning at all. Though the universe appears to us as if it is eternally changing, the entire universe is not a train of railway coaches which goes from one place to another; the whole world or universe does not exist in one region or in one time. It being so, it would not be in keeping with reasoning to say either that the world or universe comes out of deep sleep which is of the nature of Pure Existence or enters into it. In reality, it, i.e. the world, does not exist at all. For, the world does not exist apart from its state, the state does not exist apart from Pure Existence. For that reason only, Gaudapaada (Sri Shankaraachaarya's grand preceptor) has stated: "If the world or universe were existing, it would have gone; all this duality is mere illusion only; in reality, non-duality alone (*i.e. Pure Existence alone*) exists" — (*Maandukya Kaarika* 1-17). Between Pure Existence and the waking and the dream states there does not exist any cause-effect relationship. The world, having been imbued with various forms in the waking and in the dream, does not get hidden without being seen in the deep sleep; the manifested (*Vyakta or Vyaakrita*) world as well as the world which is said to be merged in *Atman* or the Self (*Avyakta or Avyaakrita*), i.e. unmanifested world, is in the absolute sense in *Atman* or the Self Himself who is of the essential nature of Pure Existence, without a second. The statement that — 'The world or universe is born from *Atman*' — is made in the *Shruti* or the scriptural texts (*Upanishads*) for two purposes. Just as what is born out of clay is clay alone, what is born out of *Atman* or Pure Existence is *Atman* alone or of the

Rarest Archives

essential nature of Pure Existence; just as the rope is not different from the rope-snake, the world or universe is not different from *Atman* or Pure Existence — to help create such a knowledge is one purpose (*Maandukya Kaarika* 2-17, 3-15 *Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-14). To those who believe that this world is really created, to those aspirants with common intelligence, through the path of meditations (*Upaasana Maarga*), providing the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality is another purpose (*Kaarika* 3-1; *Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-14). The path of meditations is not included in the system of determining the Ultimate Reality that we have now followed; that path being concerned with observance or performance of certain disciplines with devotion or dedication we have to deal with the relationship between that path and the philosophical teaching (about the Ultimate Reality) of Vedanta separately. **When observed through the viewpoint of the deliberation on the Ultimate Reality the fact that no world or universe has ever been born or created is alone the absolute Truth (Sutra Bhashya 2-1-7: Maandukya Kaarika 2-32).** If one wants to know the *'Ajaativaada'*, i.e. the theory of non-creation of the universe, which is in agreement with the Vedantic teaching that — The Pure Existence or Pure Consciousness called *Atman* alone is the Ultimate or Absolute Reality' — as well as — 'The phenomenon of the world or universe never at all was born or created from that Pure Existence or *Atman'* — then one should read Sri Gaudapaadaachaarya's *Maandukya Karikas*; then the excellent teaching that the concept of cause-effect is totally a delusion will be imbibed by the mind of the reader. For the statements made by the *Bhaashyakaara* or commentator, viz. Sri Shankaraachaarya like — 'Names and forms are

Rarest Archive

conceived in *Atman* or Pure Existence or Consciousness through misconception (of the nature of delusion)' — (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-14) and 'They, not being anything different from *Atman*, are *Atman* alone' — what we have delineated here is alone the opinion or purport. **Therefore, Pure Existence or Consciousness in its essential nature is neither manifested (Vyakta) nor unmanifested (Avyakta); neither one that gets transformed nor changed (Aparinaami). All these phenomena, like 'getting manifested' or 'being unmanifested', 'getting transformed' or being without transformations', are false appearances that are conceived to exist in that Pure Existence or Consciousness alone from the waking viewpoint.**

85. Pure Existence is neither the object nor the subject :

Atman of the form or nature of Pure Existence is not an object to anything whatsoever. Although we have delineated above that the states as well as the world or universe that appear as objects are in their essential natures Pure Existence or Consciousness alone, it should not be conceived that Pure Existence means literally 'clean existence' which remains after removing all the characteristics of a particular object or thing. Not only is it possible for Pure Existence of the form of an object, being devoid of characteristics or features, to be observed or objectified by us, but also the objective form, being merely a concept of the mind, is as much a misconception or delusion as a horn of hare. Why we call *Atman* — 'Pure Existence' — is because in It there is no possibility of stating or mentioning any characteristics whatsoever.

Rarest Archives

To denote that Entity of *Atman* or Pure Existence-Consciousness no mental concept whatsoever is capable. The mental concept is capable of denoting only the objective forms like substance (*Dravya*), quality (*Guna*), action (*Karma*), species (*Jaati*), relationship (*Sambandha*), non-existence (*Abhaava*). But *Atman* is not an object at all (with these features). Even when He is appearing in the forms of all things as objects, like the state, the world, the substances existing in the world, *Atman* who is illumining them exists as of the form of the Witness alone, being the subject of all those phenomena. Even so, it cannot even be said that He is a subject. For, He in His essential nature Itself called deep sleep; being neither the object nor the subject, is the substratum for both these. **From that Origin of Pure Existence alone, called Atman, the two off-shoots of object and subject get manifested in the waking and the dream as being eternally related and then become merged into one in deep sleep.**

86. Pure Existence is neither essencelessness (shoonya) nor is It a thing born from another :

Although it is not possible to objectify the essential nature of Pure Existence through any percept and to describe It through any statement, It is not essencelessness (*Shoonya*). For, It is the inner essence Itself (i.e. our core of Being) of all of us. In Sanskrit the epithet or appellation used for that *Atman* or Pure Existence-Consciousness, viz. *Prathyagaatma* or the innermost Self, has this meaning alone. That *Atman* who is mentioned in the manner — "That is Reality, That is *Atman* or

Rarest Archive

the Self, that alone thou art" — in the scriptural text (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 6-8-7) is that Pure Existence-Consciousness alone. For the fact that this Pure Existence alone is our *Atman* or Self, our daily experience alone of the nature of saying: "I alone slept, dreamt and woke up" — which is a feeling that all the three states belong to us only, is the support. For, it is not possible for anything else other than this Pure Existence-Consciousness which observes or witnesses all tho three states as a Witness (*Saakshi*) to say that — "I alone exist in all those three states'. We can cast aside all our extraneous forms or natures (i. e. those which are not the essential aspects of our real Being), but it is not possible whatsoever to cast aside our nature of Pure Existence-Consciousness. We have found out that everything is manifested by Pure Existence by the examination of the three states. **It is not even possible to imagine or conceive that Pure Existence or Consciuosness must have been born or created from anything else.** For, the statement that — 'Pure Existence is caused or created from Pure Existence or Consciousness alone" — has no meaning. To draw apart that Pure Existence-Consciousness from the empirical existence with special features of the states, the world and the material objects is contradictory to everyone's experience; for, all those phenomena are manifested or projected in Pure Existence alone. It is not possible at all to cause or create them from essencelessness, because essencelessness (*Shoonya*) means 'a thing in which nothing whatsoever exists' only. Therefore, "*Sat* i.e. the Ultimate Reality or Pure Existence-Consciousness is not born from anything else" (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-3-9). Hence, there is no logical device whatsoever to say either that this Pure Existence-Consciousness which we

Rarest Archives

can cognize directly through our Intuitive experience and which is our *Atman* or Self, i,e. our very essence or core of Being, is not the Absolute or Ultimate Reality or that It is essencelessness.

87. Pure Existence is of the form of Pure Knowledge (Consciousness) and Pure Happiness (Bliss):

Although all through this Chapter we have made an attempt only to find out or determine the Absolute Reality of Pure Existence, because of the fact that no existence whatsoever is established without the Pure Knowledge or Consciousness of the Witness (*Saakshi* or *Atman*, the Self) as well as of the fact that Pure Existence of the Witness is of the essential nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness alone, **what we have so far called 'Pure Existence' is of the essential nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness too. Because this Pure Existence is our Atman or Self Itself, It alone is predominant in all things that are said to be dear to us; therefore, this Pure Existence is of the essential nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss also.** When we endeavoured to find out or cognize the Absolute or Transcendental Reality of Existence we 'Intuited' It in Its own form or essential nature first in deep sleep alone. Therefore, it is but natural to anticipate that That Ultimate or Absolute Reality exists therein in deep sleep in the form, or essential nature, of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness as well as of the form, or essential nature, of Pure Happiness or Bliss, just as It exists in the form of Pure Existence. This anticipation cannot be futile at all. For, to say that It existed in deep sleep in the form of Pure Existence our experience of deep

Rarest Archive

sleep alone was the basis or support and hence it becomes established that It existed there in deep sleep in the form of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness. In the experience of the nature of — "I was asleep so far, I did not know anything" — the following three factors or aspects are implicit: 'I was in deep sleep'; 'I was in the form or of the nature of Knowledge or Consciousness'; 'Therein no object of knowledge whatsoever was perceived'. This experience implies not only saying that — 'I in deep sleep existed in the form, or the essential nature, of Pure Existence which was devoid of characteristics or qualities, which was devoid of divisions and devoid of differences',— but also saying that — 'I existed in the form, or the essential nature, of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness without any perceptible substrate or object'. In the same manner, because we hanker after deep sleep with a desire — I should get sleep, no dream whatsoever should come in the way of my deep sleep' — and because after we wake up we get the 'memory' of the nature of — 'I slept happily; no hardship or harm from anything whatsoever was encountered' — there is valid support to say that in deep sleep ours is a nature of Bliss or happiness *par excellence* which is devoid of any substrate, devoid of any object and devoid of any characteristics or qualities. Thus because the fact that 'this one Ultimate Reality alone exists in the three forms of Pure Existence, Pure Knowledge or Consciousness and Pure Happiness or Bliss, becomes clear or evident to us from the Intuitive experience of deep sleep alone, how important is the deliberation of this state for our present consideration — this fact emerges out boldly. Just as by the cosideration so far made about the three states many invaluable aspects

Rarest Archives

or facts regarding Pure Existence have come to light, we get a high expectation that it will be beneficial as regards Pure Knowledge or Consciousness as well as Pure Happiness or Bliss also if this method of examination of the three states is followed. Therefore, we will conclude here the deliberation on Pure Existence and will endeavour in the following chapters to churn out the three states from the points of view of Pure Knowledge as also Pure Happiness.

IV. THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE (CONSCIOUSNESS)

(A) Atman Or The Self Alone Is The Real Knowledge Or Consciousness

88. The greatness of the consideration of Knowledge or Consciousness :

The consideration or deliberation upon Knowledge (Consciousness) is very important for all philosophers or exponents of spiritual science ; for, the main means or instrument which the philosophers or spiritual teachers use is itself Knowledge, and the Ultimate Reality that they

Rarest Archive

are trying to find out is also 'Knowledge' To Vedantins especially who say that the ultimate goal of all human endeavour or life is attained only by the Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality (of *Atman* or the Self or Pure Knowledge or Consciousness) even if it is said that this deliberation or discriminative consideration is their very life force or breath (*Pancha Praana* i.e. the five aspects of life force) it will not be an exaggeration. We have described in the previous Chapter that *Atman* or the Self is Pure Existence ; but with the support, or on the strength, of which (experience) did we decide this Pure Existence ? Was It not on the strength of the Intuitive experience (or Intuition, to be short) that exists in us naturally ? If *Atman* or the Self, i.e. the Witness, in all of us, who is of the essential nature of Pure Existence — Knowledge — Happiness, were only Pure Existence without any relationship with Pure Knowledge, what value would He have gained ? Can the worth or competence of Pure Existence be independent if it has to be decided or determined on the strength of Knowledge alone ? It is true that man has immense love for living. Continually seeing the beauty of the world around him, he admires it ; he is delighted or elated ; he becomes engrossed. He carries out transactions in that world with others who look like him. He keeps on hankering after acquiring objects or things which he wants and keeping away from things which are not wanted. But either for his transaction of the nature of action or for his transaction of the nature of enjoyment to be carried on, a 'light' is very essential. That alone is the 'light of Knowledge'. If there were no Knoweldge, all that would have been a forest engulfed in pitch darkness.

Rarest Archive

If there is no Knowledge how could it flash to anyone, or one could be enlightened, in the manner — 'I exist', 'Such and such is dear to me', or 'I am glad' or 'I am unhappy or grief-stricken'? If that Knowledge or Consciousness is not there, where is man's living? For all these reasons, it is proper or fully justified for the greatest status being given in our deliberation to 'Knowledge'. From this point of view, it would have been proper for us to have undertaken the consideration of the Ultimate or Absolute Reality or essence of Existence only after determining the Absolute Reality or essence of Knowledge. For, man does not have anything else whatsoever which is as near to him as Knowledge or Consciousness. Through 'Knowledge or Consciousness' alone all else gets related to him. Even so, there is propriety in our giving priority to the Ultimate or Absolute Reality of Existence. That is, man by nature is looking outside only, extrovertedly. It is his nature to witness the greatness or excellence, the variety or diversity, the beauty of charm of the world which he has believed to exist outside and get lost in wonder (*Kathopanishad* 2-1-1). Hardly one or two persons cognize or realize that in him there is 'Knowledge or Consciousness' and that by virtue of that 'Knowledge or Consciousness' alone he observes and perceives everything and carries on his day-to-day transactions; then he gets the distinctive knowledge of the type — 'I', 'the remaining', 'knowledge', 'existence'. Then he shows interest or zeal not merely in transactions of the nature of manual work alone but also in transactions of the nature of deliberation or intellectual reasoning. Therefore, following this natural order (of proclivities in man in

Rarest Archive

general) we have now started to consider, or deliberate upon, the Ultimate or Absolute Reality of Knowledge or Consciousness.

89. Two opinions regarding Knowledge ;

Because knowledge comes to light in our empirical transactions following, or shadowing, existence alone and because of the reason alone that it illumines existence, man surrenders his mind preferentially (i. e. gives priority or more importance) to the consideration of knowledge — we will carry out the deliberation regarding Knowledge or Consciousness step by step following the same order (system) which we adopted previously with regard to the consideration of Existence. First of all, What is meant by Knowledge ?' — this question itself has to be considered. Although on the face of it, i. e. if observed superficially, Knowledge appears within us. Because it desiderates the external objects and it is having origination and relationship, and because while it is appearing it is susceptible to the measurements of 'more or less', the phenomenon of Knowledge seems to be a certain quality or characteristic which is born and appears in our body every now and then. But when the deliberative capacity or ratiocinating power becomes strong or mature, it is felt that — ' Because nothing is perceived or cognized whatsoever if there is no knowledge or consciousness, a certain Entity of Knowledge or Consciousness Itself must be an independent Reality'. The philosophers have strengthened both these opinions which thus naturally flash to the mind of man and

Rarest Archive

have provided or adduced the support of scriptures too to these opinions. Therefore, it can be stated that in this matter the philosophers or thinkers also have divided themselves predominantly into two groups. The people who have propounded the theory that somehow the 'Knowledge or Consciousness' is caused by the relationship with the object are of one group (called the Realists); the people who contend that Knowledge or Consciousness is an Entity which appears in us independently and through that Knowledge or Consciousness alone we acquire the knowledge of the material object are of another group (called the Idealists). Among those who have adopted or accepted the doctrines of the first group we can include all the three groups of India's *Chaarvaakas* (Materialists), *Taarkikas* (Logicians) and the modern physical scientists all over the world; in the second group, i.e. Idealists, we can include Buddhists and *Vijnaanavaadins*.

90. The theory that consciousness is a characteristic of a material object :

Chaarvaakas or *Lokaayatas*, who were believing in perception alone, were saying : Breathing, moving about, knowing, memorizing — all these are the characteristics of the body alone. These appear within the body only and do not appear without the body. It is true that Knowledge or Consciousness is not to be seen in the external material objects; only after they (objects) are transformed into forms in our body the Knowledge or Consciousness therein gets split up somehow and is imbibed or absorbed; to say either that this Knowledge or Consciousness is an independent

Rarest Archives

entity or that it is the characteristic of the soul is merely because of delusion; there is no support whatsoever of any evidence for those opinions. The philosophers or thinkers belonging to this school are not to be found at all today in India. But many of the Western thinkers are even today expounding, for all purposes, opinions belonging to this school only. There have arisen may differences of opinion with regard to this among the Western Materialists. Some say that Knowledge or Consciousness is a certain characteristic which is to be seen only in human beings and some higher spscies of creatures in whom the nervous system and the sensory organs exist; some say that it exists in all creatures, movable and immovable; some others say that it is a characteristic that exists in each and every tissue or cell of every part of the body of such creatures; yet some others say that it is a particular primary characteristic or quality existing in all kinds of elemental sub-atoms — In all such ways they have variously conceived. Predominantly it can be said that today the opinion alone of people who have believed that 'knowledge or consciousness is a certain characteristic of the brain has spread extensively and abundantly. In the brain there is a certain outer cover, soft like butter; by examination it has been seen that if some parts of it are destroyed owing to any disease Knowledge or Consciousness as well as the thinking power associated with those parts, respectively, is lost. Seeing, hearing, speaking etc. — for such different kinds of knowledges there are different centres in the brain. If these centres are healthy, then alone their respective knowledges or faculties are caused. By the drinking of some liquids like coffee, tea etc. the reasoning or thinking power is stimulated; musk,

Rarest Archive

camphor etc. revive consciousness which is lost in fainting or swoon; if chloroform is administered consciousness is lost or one becomes insensible. If knowledge or consciousness were a certain independent entity, there was no cause for it to have depended like this upon external materials. It is also in our experience that in man as well as in mammals which are similar to man, consciousness is changing and that by internal causes like food and flow of blood etc. and by such external causes like injury to the brain and stimulating of it in a certain manner also consciousness can always be varied or changed. Apart from this, the same person gets different kinds of knowledge or consciousness in different circumstances and at different times. The same person who stated the previous day — "This is my nature or habit" — is saying today — "My nature or habit has changed". When man is yet a small baby, his knowledge or consciousness is dull; after many days in him the consciousness of 'I' will sprout out; then by his living together with his parents and his teacher there is a big change in his knowledge or consciousness; when he becomes mature (a major) his reasoning power will further blossom or evolve; finally, he becomes old and becomes a victim of the saying — "At sixty, knowledge is lost". Thus as and when man's body organs change, in accordance with that change his knowledge keeps on changing. The phenomenon or fact of a different level of knowledge or consciousness seen in each one of the human beings and the fact that originally in ancient times the human race, having been in a very backward state living in forests like aborigines, as and when it, i.e, the human race, elevated itself to a state of civilization the knowledge

Rarest Archive

or consciousness of its members also got evolved and their culture too blossomed forth — All these facts are evidences to give more support to say that knowledge or consciousness is a characteristic of the body and that it is a special feature of the power of the human brain and not by itself an independent entity. This is the general opinion of the Materialists or Realists.

91. The theory that knowledge is independent :

The Indian logicians were not accepting, — like the *Chaarvaakas'* opinion that 'knowledge was a characteristic only of the body' — the opinion that knowledge was a characteristic alone of the material object. It was their doctrine that when perceiving the object through the senses knowledge is caused after being related to the mind as well as to the soul. Knowledge, in their opinion, was a characteristic or quality of the soul. It is the opinion of these logicians that the fact that people transacting in the manner — "I am knowing", "My knowledge is proper" etc. — is itself support for saying that knowledge is a characteristic of the soul. In their opinion too knowledge or consciousness is an entity having changes of the kind — getting born and disappearing — invariably. Saying that, instead of knowledge being the characteristic of the material object, it is the characteristic of the soul — is the special feature of the logicians' doctrine. Although this doctrine distinguishes between the object existing outside and the knowledge 'within' which illumines that object, by an examination or analysis of this doctrine alone there

Rarest Archive

is scope for the emergence of the theory of Idealism (*Vijnaanavaada*). To know or understand how this is possible, the method of reasoning or dialectics adopted by the Indian Buddhists has to be studied. Among the Buddhists there were two groups known as "*Sautraantikas*" and "*Vijnaanavaadins*". Between these two groups the **Sautraantikas' doctrine** was: "Although it is true that in order to determine the external object our inner knowledge or consciousness alone was the means, it is not possible for us to know the object directly 'as it is' (per se), for all objecits are ephemeral or transient. But from the objects various forms taking shape in our mind is true, and we can imagine the external object in the manner — 'That thing alone is the object from which these forms are caused. It is true that there are two different transactions of the types — 'We saw the fire directly in the hearth' and seeing smoke on the top of the hill we imagined that there is fire on the hill top. But in both these cases we only imagine the external object and we do not perceive directly any object whatsoever. However, the fire in the hearth causes directly its form in the consciousness; the fire on the hill top causes or creates its form through the medium of the smoke. Therefore, in one case there is a transaction that — 'We saw the fire' and in another case there is the transaction that — 'We imagined the fire'. In this manner because it is possible to conceive a proper cause or reason for all differences in epistemology or modes or transactions of knowledge, our opinion or doctrine is not opposed whatsoever to experience. That an object or a thing is one which is fit to be imagined by virtue of its causing or creating a form in our knowledge or consciousness alone is

Rarest Archives

an irrefutable philosophical teaching or truth". This is the opinion or doctrine of the "*Sautraantika*" Buddhists.

Now let us turn our attention towards **the doctrine of the Vijnaanavaadins** : "Just as the *Sautraantikas* say, if all our empirical transactions are carried on on the basis of the forms of consciousness alone — why should we conceive of an entity or object different from consciousness or knowledge ? Why should we not assume that consciousness itself appears as the form of the object ? **The protagonists of (the existence of) outside objects** (*Baahya Vastu Astitwa Vaadi* or the Realist) may argue or contend that because without any cause in one and the same consciousness there cannot appear as different forms of the type — black, yellow etc., one should accept an object which is the cause for this difference in forms. But look at the dream. There also it appears to us as if different objects are perceived ; even so, it is acceptable to everyone that there, external to or beyond the consciousness. no object whatsoever exists. Thus because it can be established from the example of the dream that various forms of objects may appear by virtue of the previous latent impression of consciousness or knowledge even without the existence of objects outside, it is reasonable only to assume that in the waking too mere forms of consciousness alone exist and not that the objects, which are said to be the cause for it, do exist independently. Apart from this, even those who accept the concept of the existence of the objects outside also agree that those

Rarest Archive

objects appear along with consciousness alone. We have never seen merely a black object apart from knowledge or consciousness of the object which is black in colour. If the object exists apart from consciousness, why should it not exist independently by itself without desiderating consciousness or knowledge? Another consideration: What is meant by saying that a thing is an object to the consciousness? Is it not being the form only of the consciousness? If that is so, it becomes evident by itself that the object of Consciousness is merely the form of consciousness. If not, if the object is different from the form and the former exists independently, it will amount to saying that there is no relationship whatsoever between the form and the object; anything can be the object to any knowledge or consciousness whatsoever. As this is not acceptable to anyone, it becomes established that consciousness knows itself by itself and that there is no object different or apart from consciousness. This is the opinion of the *Vijnaanavaadins* or the Idealists.

Just as in our country (i. e. in India) the Logicians' (*Taarkikas'*) theory of perceptual knowledge (*Pratyaksha Vaada*) by stages turned (or developed) into Idealistic theory or Idealism (*Vijnaana Vaada*), similarly in the Western countries too the theory of Realists (*Baahya Vastu Satyatwa Vaada*) in due course paved the way for Idealism (*Vijnaana Vaada*). There is benefit in knowing the description of this to a little extent. In those countries too (i. e. in the West), just as here, people started explaining the perceptual knowledge first from

Rarest Archive

the object only. It is the opinion of the Materialists (*Bhautikagna*) that the ray of light that falls on the object, after it returns and comes in contact with the eye, this sensation or stimulation transforms the brain through the nervous system. Those who opined that apart from the brain there exists a thing called mind, instead of saying that the reaction or response of the brain itself was knowledge or consciousness, they were saying that the knowledge of the external object was caused by the external sensation or stimulation reaching the mind through the brain. Although these people had accepted that external object was real, it can be said that their theory was akin to the theory or doctrine of *Śautraantikas* of our country. For, according to their opinion all that we directly come to know in relation to the external object are merely some concepts (*Vedanas*) like sound, touch, form, taste etc.; because we are getting confidence or faith that these concepts are the effects caused in our senses or mind by the relationship with the external object, the concepts become the representatives of the external objects. Therefore, instead of the direct knowledge of the external object accruing to us, it amounts to saying that we imagine it (i.e. the external object) in a sequential order through the concepts caused by it. This is called the **Theory of Representative Perception** (*Prateeka Pratyaksha Vaada*). It is clear that just as in the theory or doctrine of *Sautraantikas* the forms of knowledge or consciousness are the means for imagining the object, in this theory the concepts are the means. To come down to this step amounts to opening the main door to the entry of Idealism (*Vijnaana Vaada*). For, if all that we know are

Rarest Archive

concepts (feelings or emotions etc.) only, then there are no means of evidence whatsoever to say that apart from these concepts the external objects exist independently. Therefore, there is no support to say that these concepts are caused by the external objects or they become known to us as representatives of those external objects. All that appear to our mind are its thoughts or ideations only. Among the functions or faculties of the mind, like direct perception, remembering imagining etc , wherever we observe there is no cause at all to assume that apart from the thought or concept there exists an object. It can be said that because all that become objects to us are nothing but concepts alone, the groups themselves of these concepts we are transacting as several objects. This was the first theory of Idealism born among the Westerners

92. Defects in Idealism (Vijnaana Vaada) as well as Realism (Vishaya Satyatwa Vaada) :

As and when the Idealists and Realists went on showing or pointing out defects in each other's theories, their main doctrines too had been changing. Therefore, today among the Westerners not only there have arisen quite a number of splinter groups of Idealism as well as Realism but also, without being too different, these two schools have got mixed up with each other and woven into a bizarre fabric. As it is not our intention to write a history of the Western philosophies, we will give up this consideration here and return to the present consideration of knowledge or consciousness. Just as the Realists, who say that the

Rarest Archives

object of knowledge or consciousness is independent and by virtue of its relationship knowledge is caused in the brain or in the mind, have not been able to pin-point and show what is meant by knowledge or consciousness, the Idealists too, who are stubborn in saying that the object which is different either from the form of knowledge or from the emotions or feelings that appear in consciousness does not at all exist, are not capable of showing the essential nature of consciousness or knowledge as such and such. Whether the changes that appear every now and then in consciousness are caused only by the external stimulating materials or whether they are produced by certain causes within the mind, how do these distinct differences in the consciousness, which were not there first, are produced? Does any entity or object whatsoever which is the essence of consciousness or knowledge exist or not? If not, how is the experience of the nature of — "Such and such knowledge we got" — caused? — This aspect both the schools have not clarified.

How does knowledge accrue to us? — In this regard there is difference of opinion between the Realists and the Idealists. Let it be in any manner; both have not been able to explain the birth of knowledge or consciousness to the complete satisfaction of an aspirant. The ancient Logicians as well as the present-day physical scientists have opined that because of the relationship or contact between the senses and the external objects alone the knowledge of the object is caused. It is the theory of the Logicians that when the soul comes into contact with the mind and then the

Rarest Archive

mind gets into contact with the sense organ and thereafter when there is contact between the sense organ and the object, the perceptual knowledge (*Pratyaksha Jnaana*) is born. It is the theory of the physical scientists that 'the perceptual knowledge of objects is produced because of certain changes caused in the nerves of the eyes and in some parts of the brain, which are related to those nerves, when the light that has fallen on the object reflects back and comes into contact with the eyes'. We have got some questions which are to be put to them. However the manner in which some concepts as well as emotions or feelings are caused in us may be — they are produced within us only; they are not all objects. It being so, what is the reason for the knowledge of the type of — "This is a stone", "This is a tree" etc. — being produced, instead of the knowledge of the type of — "I got such and such a concept or idea", "I have such and such emotion or feeling" — being produced? When there is no contact or relationship between us and an object, why is a knowledge of the type of — "This is such and such a thing" — produced? Although between us and the object the mind, the brain, the senses — all these exist, without the consciousness or knowledge of the intermediate entities like the brain etc. whatsoever, the knowledge itself of the object which is at a distance is directly produced! Why is it so? Now, what we have to ask the *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists is: The brain, the senses, the object — all these being knowledge or consciousness alone, how was the knowledge or consciousness that 'they are different' produced? To these questions which we have put here both these protagonists have not been able to answer. How do

Rarest Archives

we come to 'know' the objects which exist outside our mind? Though the changes — which the thinkers opine to be taking place within us only when we are knowing the objects — are very close to us, why do not they appear to our consciousness? — To such questions to give answers it has become extremely difficult for these protagonists.

Yet another knotty problem is faced by these protagonists who are caught in this predicament, and that is; It is in everyone's experience that the perceptual knowledge occurs in the form of — "Now I am seeing such and such an external object" — only. What means of evidence is there to say that the object, which we are believing to exist outside or externally to the emotions or feelings and the concepts that occur in our mind, really exists? If there is no means of evidence whatsoever, then what happens to the steadfast or innate belief of people that we are seeing the external object alone? Anyway, in the contention of the Realists there is no support or proof to say either that outside us objects exist or that they have the power or capability of bringing about a change in our mind or an effect on our mind; even in case there is support, there is no reason forthcoming to answer the question — "Why should not all objects create this kind of change or effect at one and the same time?" As one's senses, nerves, brain etc. cannot be seen by oneself, one has to believe that they exist on the assurance or testimony of others' statement and hence that cannot be a scientific (*Shaastreeya*) knowledge; even in case it is accepted that they, i.e. our senses, nerves, brain etc.,

Rarest Archive

exist, there is no guarantor whatsoever to say that the mind has properly grasped the essential nature of an object which has flown down passing through so many outlets or sluices. **All these are the hindrances or hurdles that exist for the Materialists or Realists (Baahya Vishaya Satyatwa Vaadins).**

Just to surmount or overcome these hurdles if it is stated that everything is consciousness alone (or knowledge alone), then how did the divisions of the type of object and subject (*Vishaya, Vishayi*) come about in one and the same consciousness or knowledge? Why is it that everyone of us gets the experience of the type — "I have known this" — alone? Why does it not appear in the manner — All this is consciousness alone"? If there is no object or thing whatsoever different or apart from consciousness, why does the variety or diversity of the types — black, yellow, hard, soft, far off, nearby, circular, flat etc. — appear? If it is contended that — 'All this is the nature or characteristic of consciousness, why is our experience not like that? If it is said that all this is delusion, why should it not be said that the argument that — 'Everything is consciousness' — is also a delusion? If it is said that consciousness or knowledge is in our experience, then the object is also in our experience indeed! What authority is there for the Idealist, *Vijnaana Vaadin*, to refute the object which is in everyone's experience? If it is not proper to believe the existence of one's senses, nerves etc., on others' statement or testimony, how can it be acceptable to the Idealist especially to believe that others exist?

Rarest Archive

If that is also rejected, the disputant who believes that — "I alone exist" — to whom does he attempt to convince, shall we say? **Thus the Realist also can pile up objections one upon another on the Idealist.**

Similarly, with regard to the experience that occurs in the manner — "I am knowing this" — if the question is asked — "Is the phenomenon of 'I' a different entity which is the support or substrate for knowedge or consciousness or everything is consciousness only ?" — these disputants cannot arrive at a unanimous decision. The Logicians of our country are *Aatma Vaadins*; that means, people who say that apart from the two — the senses, the mind there exists a soul (*Atma*). Therefore, they were saying that knowledge or consciousness was a characteristic (*Dharma*) of the soul. It was their belief that in the phenomenon of the nature of — "I know", the 'I' notion that appears in us is itself *Atman* or the Self (our essential nature of Being). Their doctrine or theory also is not without blemish or defect, for just as, although it is our experience that the object exists outside, the essential nature of the object slipped out without being included within the ken of our deliberation, in the same manner here in the statement — "I know" — the essential nature of the agent of knowledge, i. e. the 'I' notion, who is separate or different from Pure Knowledge or Consciousness slips out without being within the ken of knowledge. This 'I' notion is not an object like external objects or things ; nor is it the agent of knowledge (subject) like the mind or *Vijnaana*. Then in that case, what else is it ? It is not possible even

Rarest Archives

to imagine the Reality or Entity which is neither the object nor the subject !

93. The need of the comprehensive viewpoint of deliberation for the determination of the Ultimate Reality or essential nature of Pure Knowledge (Consciousness) :

In the previous section if it is observed in the manner we have indicated or explained to a little extent, then it becomes evident or clear that either the Idealistic theory or the Realistic theory cannot thrive independently. To the Realist, the external world alone is everything ; he aspires somehow to extract from it 'knowledge' or 'consciousness'. To the Idealist, mind alone is everything ; he aspires somehow to project the object from the mind or *Vijnaana*. Without explaining as to how a relationship between the object and the mind is caused and how the perceptual knowledge is caused, the Realist has conceived or imagined that outside the objects exist independently and that they are capable of creating a stimulation or sensation which can cause the perceptual knowledge. Without explaining as to how the appearance of the object was caused in the mind (Vijnaana), the Idealist has imagined or concieved that that appearance is the nature or characteristic of the mind. Thus for both, imagination alone is the support ; both have the support of certain dialectical arguments ; in the theories of both there are defects. The essential nature of knowledge or consciousness cannot possibly be found in both these theories.

Rarest Archive

Even so, from the disputations between these two groups one decision or conclusion emerges. That is: Both these, without taking into consideration experience in its entirety, have taken into their reckoning one part only of it and have endeavoured to imagine the rest. In our daily life neither the object bereft of the mind nor the mind bereft of the object have been experienced by us. Contrary to this universal experience these disputants have endeavoured to wrench off the object and the objective or perceptual knowledge, each from the other, and to establish separately their independence. Therefore, not only there has arisen a quarrel between these two but also it has become a hurdle or hindrance in determining the essential nature of knowledge or consciousness. Hence from this disputation what we should remember is that giving up this path of observing the Ultimate Reality by dividing and distributing It, it is better only to follow the path of the comprehensive outlook of the three states and to observe how the essential nature of Pure Consciousness appears.

94. The method of examining properly the object and the subject;

The difficulty in determining either the essential nature of the object or the essential nature of empirical consciousness which illumines that object arises because we do not remain outside or beyond the object as well as the empirical consciousness and then examine them. Is it possible if an actor, who is on the stage dressed up and acting, attempts to see for himself how he is acting? The actor cannot see or observe his own acting and the observer cannot act at the

Rarest Archive

same time — this fact being self-evident or self-established, it flashes by itself to anyone. Even so, we remain within the waking state alone and endeavour to determine the essential nature of the empirical consciousness that appears in us in that manner only ! For that reason alone, the difficulties which have been previously described are coming in the way. But giving up this wrong path, follow the viewpoint of Intuitive experience which comprehends, like a lamp, the waking state which includes or subsumes within it both the empirical knowledge or consciousness and the object. Then see for yourself how these whole gamut of difficulties vanishes just as the fog disappears in hot sun ! The things that appear to us in the waking state, like the world, our body, senses, mind, intellect, ego — which are observing that world — all these have then become objects to us. We become the Witness (*Saakshi*) of the whole state itself. Now we must discern that the world of the waking, as also the body, the senses and the mind which are in the waking, are all confined to the waking alone and that they cannot 'get out' of the waking. **The subject and the object of the waking are both objects only to our Intuitive experience (or Intuition, to be short)**.... This fact immediately flashes clearly.

95. The Witness (Saakshi, Pure Consciousness, the Self or Atman) alone is the prime subject and the rest — though it is subject — is object alone :

Observe from this internal vision called '*Anubhava*, or Intuitive experience how the empirical knowledge or consciousness which appears in the waking seems to

Rarest Archive

be. The external objects are being illumined by the senses; those senses are being illumined by the mind; that mind appears to be belonging to me. To the mind which belongs to me the senses are objects; to the senses the outside things are objects. Therefore, if considered in one particular sense, to the outside things the senses are the subject, to the senses the mind is the subject. But which is that Witness or the prime subject which is experiencing all this ? To whom does the whole state belong ? It is clear here that we are 'witnessing' the entire state itself from a particular form or nature which is our innate essence or core of Being. This alone has been previously (sub - section 51) called by us **Saakshi or the Witness.** We are indeed seeing or perceiving the objects with our senses, the senses with our mind and the state which is said to be the conglomeration of objects, senses and mind with our Witness (*Atman* or the Self) ! Is there yet another entity which perceives this Witness ? To this question each one of us has to give the answer based on our Intuitive experience alone. We have never seen or perceived any other instrument or means of knowing the Witness. 'Knowing the Witness' — this statement does not convey any meaning; for, **as the Witness or Saakshi is our essential nature or core of Being Itself, the need of knowing It in Itself (i.e. the subject per se) does not arise at all.** For that reason alone, there is no possibility or scope for any doubt arising at any time in any one of us regarding the Intuitive experience of the Witness (Pure Consciousness). Not only that; it can be said that the Intuitive experience of the Witness (*Saakshi Anubhava*) Itself is the greatest or the highest Knowledge among all knowledges that exist in us. For example, only when there

Rarest Archives

is a relationship between the object to be known and us we get knowledge. As much this relationship becomes closer, so much more intimate will be our knowledge, we say. This alone is the reason for our attaching more value to the knowledge of things which are in front of us than to the knowledge of things which exist in far - off space or time which cannot be seen or perceived by us. For this reason alone, we have to understand that more than the knowledge of the objects which are in front of us the knowledge of the senses which are nearer to us is strong, the knowledge of the mind which is still closer to us is much stronger. If it is observed from this viewpoint, how much strong should we say is the Knowledge of the essential nature of our Witness (*Atman* or Self), which never leaves us and never goes out of our cognition even to the extent of an iota and between us and Itself, i.e. the Witness or Pure Consciousness, there does not exist anything else whatsoever (i.e. It is our very essence or core of Being or Existence - Knowledge - Bliss) ! **Thus because the strong Intuitive experience itself which does not give room at any time for any doubt to arise is the Witness (Atman or the Self) and by Itself alone we have to know everything, there is no need for another to know this Witness, nor does any such entity whatsoever exist at all.** The senses and the mind which are in our state — these become objects as well as subjects; but the Witness (*Saakshi*), in particular, is always the subject *per se,* never the object (i.e. the Witness or Self can never be objectified, but in a manner of speaking, He remains a Witness or subject *per se* always). Therefore, ***Saakshi or* the Witness alone is the Prime Subject or Witness, all else is an object alone to this Witness.**

Rarest Archives

96. The Witness of the triad of knowledge (Triputi) is Itself our essential nature of Being :

Let us now once more examine the nature of the empirical knowledge or consciousness that appears to us in the waking as an object to the Witness (*Atman* or Pure Consciousness). That knowledge is being perceived in the form of — "I am knowing this." Here the object perceptible to the empirical knowledge or consciousness, called *Jneya* or the object of knowledge, the knowledge or *Jnaana* (the instrument of knowledge), the knowing 'I' or *Jnaatru* (the knower) such a triad appears. Apart from this, to know the objects we are also using means or instruments like the senses, the inner instrument (*Antahkarana*) of mind. With the perceptual sense-organ of the eyes the object of a picture and the like, i.e. *Jneya*, which have a form, is being known by me, the knower (*Jnaatru*) ; then alone we get the result or fruit of perceptual knowledge (*Jnapti or Jnaana*). Thus devoid of this differential triad of *Jnaatru*, *Jnaana* and *Jneya* (or the knower, the means of knowledge and the object of knowledge, respectively) we have never got any kind of knowledge whatsoever in the waking; sometimes the external objects or things are the objects to our empirical knowledge or consciousness, sometimes the internal happiness, grief, conceptual knowledge etc. alone are the objects to our empirical consciousness. In any case, without the triad mentioned above we do not have any empirical knowledge. This kind of triad is called '*Triputi*'. Now one point for consideration: Just as we know or perceive the external objects or things existing in the waking through our senses, and the conceptual knowledge that is caused by the senses through the mind, with the aid of which entity do we

Rarest Archive

know the whole state which is blended or imbued, as it were, with the mind? What means or instrument do we have to 'know' this? To answer this question we do not need much time at all. We do not see or perceive it through, or with the aid of, anything whatsoever. There is no other mediate thing or entity whatsoever between us and the state. We are directly or Intuitively alone perceiving (cognizing) the state. Thus because of It perceiving or cognizing the state in its entirety directly or Intuitively (i.e. without the aid of any intermediary agent) this our essential nature of Being (i.e. *Atman* or Pure Existence - Knowledge - Bliss) is given the epithet of '*Saakshi*' (the Witness) by philosophers.

97. The Witness or Saakshi alone is the essence of Knowledge :

From the series of considerations made so far what we have come to know is : People are using the terms like 'knowledge' and 'existence' without considering the questions like — "Wherefrom do we get the light of knowledge which is the means for our daily or empirical transactions?" or "What is Its (i.e. the light of knowledge) essential nature?" Just as people, although they are always knowing or perceiving the objects invariably along with the sunlight or any other empirical source of light, they take into their reckoning only the object needed for their transactions without taking into account the sunlight or any other empirical source of light, in the same manner because people — though they are perceiving

Rarest Archive

all things in the light of Intuitive experience (Pure Consciousness) alone — they are believing that the objective perception alone is everything and are seeing with that extroverted viewpoint alone, the question — "What is Pure Consciousness?" — remains without being determined (*Upadesha Sahasri Prose* Sec. 16-5). In the day time the sun's light, in the night the light of the moon and the stars or the light of a lamp etc. .... thus all our daily transactions are carried out with the aid of light alone. But before the assistance of this light accrues to us, the empirical sources of light themselves have to be established (i.e. their existence has to be presumed), is it not? For this, the sense-perception for which the instrumental sense-organ, viz. the eyes, is very essential. To a blind person, howevermuch there might be light in the world, which object, in what manner, could be known? To know or objectify the sense-organ of the eye, the aid or assistance of the mind is needed; no one has ever perceived and known his own eyes (directly) with his eyes alone. Thus although 'the phenomenon of light' illumines everything, to 'perceive or know' the empirical or physical light the assistance of the eyes, which are something other than the former (i.e. the physical light), is needed; similarly, the assistance of the mind is also needed to 'know' the sense-organ of the eyes. Just as with the aid of the eyes alone the physical light is reckoned or cognized as light, with the aid of the mind alone the eyes are cognized as the eyes. If considered thus, it becomes established that the mind alone 'sees' the light through the outlet or doorway of the eyes, and with the assistance of that light (i.e, the empirical consciousness) is perceiving the external objects. Therefore, the capability of 'showing or illumining' the

Rarest Archive

object, in reality, is not that of the physical or empirical source of light, nor is it that of the sense-organ; both these are being 'illumined' by the mind alone. Therefore, it becomes evident that the mind alone is really the locus where the 'light of knowledge' or the empirical consciousness exists or inheres and that on the strength of that empirical consciousness alone the sense-organs, the physical sources of light and the objects, one following the other in that order, are appearing. But people who have the patience of considering or determining the question .... "Whether this mind also is the 'final locus' or is it also being 'illumined' by another entity ?" — are very rare or sparse. What the *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists call 'consciousness' is this change in the mental mode alone ; having relied only upon the experience that 'without the outlet or doorway of the mind nothing whatsoever can be known at all', as described above, they (i.e. *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists) have deduced their theory or doctrine — without considering the pros and cons — that everything is empirical consciousness or knowledge alone.

It is true that we have to know everything with the mind alone ; it is also true that just as we have determined that we can know everything through the mind alone, we have to determine the object of the mind also. Even so, there lies a difference here : While knowing everything with the mind those external things become an object to the mind. But how can the mind become an object to the mind alone ? Believing that the mind can be examined or considered by the mind alone, the present-day psychologists' theory of examining others' minds may be helpful in the

Rarest Archiver

progress of their science; but that cannot render any help whatsoever in determining 'the essential nature of mind'. For, what is said to be 'others' mind' is an entity which we have imagined. To determine by such imagination the essential nature of our mind which is directly in our innate experience can never be scientific. Let it be. The psychologists say that we can 'know' by the mind alone by means of another method called 'introspection'; for this there is support of our experience also. But here with what do we really examine our mind? Though none of the remaining entities can become objects to themselves, the mind in particular (exclusively) is becoming an object to itself! What is the secret of this phenomenon? To solve this question a great deal of wisdom as well as patience is essential. Neither the ancient *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists nor the present-day phychologists desired to go that far. They have opined that it is futile to merely believe that there exists an Entity or Reality which 'illumines' the mind too, and because it is seen in our experience 'the mind objectifying itself' and 'knowing' itself their theory alone is the final verdict. For this (misconception) their having identification with the waking viewpoint alone is the cause. If they had posed the question — "With what do we know the whole waking state?" — to themselves and had endeavoured to provide an answer to it, they would not have got the contentment of staying put in the middle of the path only. In reality, with what are we 'knowing' (i. e. cognizing or comprehending) the mind, the senses and the objects — all bundled together or in their entirety? We must examine this question fully. The Logicians of our country were saying that the *Jeevaatma* or soul was the

Rarest Archiver

substrate for the mind. But with what should we know or comprehend that the *Jeevaatma* or soul exists? If it is said — 'with the mind', then it amounts to saying that the mind is an object to the soul and the soul is an object to the mind; and the defect of mutual dependence of the type that each has to be established by the other will attach itself to this theory. Some present-day Vedantins, having first said that the *Jeeva* or soul is of the essential nature of Consciousness alone, have later on conceived that in him, i. e. the soul, there exists a quality or characteristic of Consciousness too. But they are not able to answer in keeping with everyone's experience the question — "What is the difference in the essential natures of the Consciousness which is possessing the quality and the Consciousness which is itself the quality?" Contending in the manner — "Because there is the experience of the type — 'I am knowing' — 'I' is the possessor of the quality of knowledge and 'am knowing' is its quality or characteristic" — they have given value to the waking experience alone, and just like the *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists have formulated their theory devoid of a comprehensive or far-sighted outlook or viewpoint. Let it be. If one considers the question —"Even the knowledge which appears in the form of the possessor of the quality (*Dharmee*) and the quality or characteristic (*Dharma*) as in the expression — 'I am knowing' — is it independent or has its knowledge come from any other entity?" — even then, it will have to be said perforce that all those phenomena are an object to the Witness (*Saakshi*) alone, as stated in the previous section, and that although the 'light of knowledge' appears to be in

Rarest Archives

the senses, in reality, it has come from the mind alone. Because the Witness or *Saakshi* (*Atman* or the Self) is knowing everything, it becomes certain that It is the very essential nature of Pure Consciousness or Knowledge (i.e. It is the Absolute Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence - Consciousness - Bliss); if It were not the essential nature of Consciousness at all, then how could It know or be conscious of the entire state itself without desiderating any other means or instruments of knowledge whatsoever ? The Witness has never given up Consciousness (or the capability of knowing); as stated before, there is no need of Knowledge or Consciousness coming or accruing to the Witness from any other entity (or source), nor is It an object also (to another knowing or conscious entity). Therefore, **Saakshi or the Witness alone is the very prius or fountainhead of Knowledge or Consciousness. Without being illumined by anything else, It by Itself (per se) is illumining or is self-effulgent; by Its 'light' alone our waking as well as all the waking transactions are being carried on (Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad 4-3-6)**— This truth is established.

(B) The Three Levels Of Knowledge Or Consciousness

98. As in Existence there are three levels in Knowledge or Consciousness :

If it is so, is there no Knowledge or Consciousness whatsoever in the states ? If not, all of us

Rarest Archive

have the feeling of the type — "I am knowing", "My mind is knowing", "My senses are knowing" — is it not ? We can agree if it is said that there is no knowledge either to the physical light or the objects which are seen with the help of that light, for howevermuch they may shine they are inanimate or insentient. But how can it be said that none of the *Jeevas* or human beings who exist in the world just like us and who are carrying on transactions with us has any knowledge or consciousness whatsoever ? We are all behaving with the belief alone that there exists knowledge or consciousness in people and that it increases or grows through transactions as well as teaching or instruction. Educational system is based on the foundation of this belief alone. The distinctions of enemy, friend, mediator, hostile person or alien, relative etc. are also in accordance with this belief alone. It is with this belief to the effect that there exist differences in knowledge alone that people render help or cause harm to one another or we aspire to gain their hatred or affection. What more to say ! Even people who preach the observance of the rituals or meditations for obtaining the 'bliss of other worlds' or those who preach the Intuitive knowledge of the Self or *Atman* for attaining Emancipation or Liberation also have to start their task assuming that in the world there exist people with different levels of knowledge alone. If it is not so, to whom can the Vedantins teach the Ultimate Reality? For all these reasons, in some people the doubt to the effect — "In the world also we must believe that a particular kind of knowledge exists only, is it not?" — may arise.

Rarest Archive

While answering this question we have not to state anything more at all to those who have kept in mind the system of deliberation or discrimination in the methodology of the three states and what answer we have given when the same kind of objections were raised with regard to "Existence" (sub-section 55). For, the phenomena of waking, dream and deep sleep are not entities which exist always independently apart from *Atman* or the Self who is the Witness; they have to perforce appear with the 'light of Consciousness or Knowledge' of the Witness alone. Not only that. Because the Pure Existence of the Witness is Itself their existence, the Knowledge of the Absolute or Pure Consciousness of the Witness (*Saakshi Chaitanya*) is Itself their Knowledge or Consciousness. Therefore, just as the Witness or *Saakshi* in Its innate nature is eternally Pure Consciousness alone, it amounts to saying that the states also, which are not different from It, are eternally of the essential or innate nature of Consciousness alone. This fact will be clarified a little more further on.

But for the time being, from another lower level also an answer by way of consolation can be given. That is: As stated above, because *Saakshi* or the Witness is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness which never changes at all, that Pure Consciousness or Knowledge alone can be called **'Paaramaarthika' or unchangeable or immutable Consciousness.** But merely by this it does not become established whatsoever that in whatever objects or visions we see in the waking there is no Knowledge or Consciousness at all. For, we transact in the manner — "I am knowing",

Rarest Archives

"My mind is knowing", "My senses are knowing" — alone. We are carrying on our transactions with the faith alone that our mind and senses are knowing and that like us only many others who are capable of knowing exist. Not only that. Even in the minds in which we think there does not exist any knowledge, we believe either that knowledge exists in a little or smaller measure or it remains unmanifested. In the workaday world, just as benefit accrues from knowledge, from forgetfulness desirable as well as undesirable results are caused. Therefore, it is reasonable to understand that forgetfulness also is a kind of knowledge or consciousness alone. In this manner, it will not be wrong if it is said that not only in creatures and plants but also in insentient or inanimate things also a kind of consciousness or knowledge exists unmanifested. Let it be. For the time being, within the states wherever we think there exists consciousness, just as in all those things or objects there is empirical existence or *Vyaavahaarika Satta,* similarly we can assume that in all those things there is Vyaavahaarika Jnaana or empirical consciousness also. But no consciousness or knowledge of the waking whatsoever can enter the dream. Nothing whatsoever of the knowledge or consciousness which appears in the dream can objectify the waking. Thus the consciousness or knowledge of a particular state is confined or restricted to that state alone. Even so, because this knowledge is of utility in empirical transactions, there is no objection or hindrance in thinking this to be Vyaavahaarika Jnaana or empirical knowledge or consciousness. The principal waking alone is the state which is the support for us to carry on our transactions;

Rarest Archive

therefore, the various knowledges that we gain in that state are the knowledges which are empirical or transactional. In this manner, the knowledge of silver of the nacre or sea shell, the knowledge of the snake of the rope, the knowledge of the second moon etc.— because all these in their respective durations appear like 'real knowledge' alone, they are knowledges of Praatibhaasika type (of mere appearance). Anyway, in this manner everything exists related to Consciousness or Knowledge invariably, everything is verily Consciousness alone, apart from Consciousness even the phenomenon of forgetfulness does not exist at all — These conclusions alone are the ultimate or absolute truths.

99. The knowledge or consciousness that exists in the states is not independent, it also is Pure Consciousness alone :

But we should never think or believe that the phenomenon of consciousness that appears in various forms in the states is independent. To the state which does not have an independent existence at all (sub-section 56) wherefrom should an independent consciousness accrue ? To clarify this here an illustration can be given: Imagine that a lamp has been covered by an earthen pot and that the earthen pot has several holes. Then from the earthen pot through the holes the rays of light are spread out in different directions, is it not ? Merely on that ground do we understand that all those are different lamps ? No. Similarly, when seeing from the waking viewpoint

Rarest Archive

within the pot of our body the 'lamp of Pure Consciousness or Knowledge' called *Saakshi Chaitanya* or the Witnessing Absolute Consciousness is ever burning; That not only 'flows' through the mind as well as through the various senses and creates the 'illusion' of making the mind and the senses to 'shine' but also 'illumines' the external things and 'shows' them. Then we get the experience of the type — "I am knowing this". Merely for that reason, can we think that each kind of knowledge of every one of the senses is a different (indepedent) knowledge ? This knowledge or consciousness as well as the fact that from this knowledge the objects appear — all these are the 'light' of the witnessing Consciousness alone and not anything else. It is proper to determine or decide in this manner only (*Dakshinamoorthy Stotra 4*). Without knowing this secret alone people have imagined each instrument of knowledge as having different light ; they have also accepted the separate existence of *Jeevaatma* or the soul who is of the 'form of light' and is the substrate for all those lights of the instruments of knowledge just like the sun is the substrate for all sunlight and the rays of sunlight — This fact is clear.

100. The Consciousness or Knowledge of the Witness or Saakshi is not a characteristic or quality :

We have mentioned above that *Vaisheshikas* (a school of Indian philosophy in the pre-Shankara period who specialized in an indigenous atomic theory of creation of the universe) and some present-day Vedantins also have opined that Consciousness or Knowledge is a quality or characteristic of *Jeevaatma* or the

Rarest Archive

soul alone, is it not? Because in the transactions of the waking it appears in that manner, as also by assuming like that it facilitates empirical transactions, there is no harm whatsoever in assuming that the **consciousness which is endowed with the Vyaavahaarika Satta or the empirical existence or reality is our quality or characteristic.** But in the absolute sense or view-point, to think or imagine that Pure Consciousness is this kind of consciousness alone, there lurks a danger. Those who wish to know what that danger is should first understand what meaning we have presumed in our customary dealings to the word, 'consciousness'. The scientists describe the manner in which the phenomenon of consciousness or knowledge is born or caused in man as follows,: The creature belonging to the human species (homo sapiens) is a particular special evolutionary feature that has taken place in the gradual or stage-by-stage development from the lower kinds of creatures. Among the creatures, according to the laws of heredity (*Vamsha Gunaanvaya*) and adaptation to external circumstances or environmental conditions (*Sanniveshaanuguna Parinaama*), from the previous species of creatures the next species of creatures have been evolved in a sequential order. The biologists have determined that according to the laws of 'the struggle for existence, and 'natural selection' among the families or species of the creatures the structural features of their respective organs etc. as well as their functional features are formulated. Man, according to this law, is the progeny of a certain special premogenitor (*Moolapurusha Vishesha*) belonging to the species of apes. The senses, the brain and the nervous system that are seen in him and the knowledge or conscious-

Rarest Archive

ness that is caused in them are merely the reactions that are caused in his body from the external circumstances. For this reason, consciousness or knowledge will have to be said to be — like itching that is caused in the body — a particular kind of characteristic or quality alone. The Materialists or Realists, who are predominant of late among the Westerners, are keeping rhythm to, or dancing to the tune of, the scientists, and some say that consciousness or knowledge means a certain action, some others say that it is a special relationship and yet some others say that it is neither mental nor physical but is the transformation or metamorphosis of an indescribable thing which is indifferent to or uninvolved in both i.e. mental or physical functions — In all such ways they are arguing. The main defect in all Materialistic or Realistic theories - we have made known previously itself (sub-section 97). Having started the task of finding out the essential nature of mind or consciousness, to have determined that it is a thing which is within the realm of the inquirer's examinations and anticipation (or expectations) is itself that defect. **That which appears as an object to examinations and expectations or anticipations is another person's imagined (*Kalpita*) mind alone and not one's own real mind.** Howevermuch precisely or strictly we decide or determine the development of the mind which is an object, it does not amount whatsoever to have found out the essential nature of our inner Consciousness which is needed to examine that object, i. e. the mind which is an object (meaning — our mind can only be really objectified and analysed with the help of Pure Consciousness alone, the Witness). Taking the state or condition of the mind that exists now as the one

Rarest Archives

basis, merely by imagining in the manner — "For the mind to have reached this condition it must have undergone such and such changes" — can it amount to having decided or determined the essential nature of consciousness? Let the scientist or materialist, who from the objective viewpoint observes the functions of the body and determines that consciousness is its quality or characteristic, observe through the subjective or introspective viewpoint of the mind belonging to himself who is the examiner (that is, his own Intuitive experience point of view), then immediately it flashes to him that all the phenomena of the body functions are the result of a distinct ideation or conception caused or produced in the mind. Instead of the consciousness becoming the quality of the body, the body itself will be known to be the 'object of consciousness'. Then the hand of the Idealist (*Vijnaana Vaadin*) himself will be raised as a sign of victory. But we have already (sub-section 92) mentioned the defects in the *Vijnaana Vaada* or Idealistic theory. **Just as the Realist or Materialist has forgotten his own Consciousness and is observing only the external physique or body, the Idealist has forsaken the Witness or Pure Consciousness which is the essential nature or core of Being of the empirical consciousness and is examining only the external object of empirical consciousness or knowledge.** For the *Vaisheshikas* and some present-day Vedantins also to have imagined or thought that consciousness is a quality or characteristic, the cause is their taking this wrong viewpoint alone.

Rarest Archive

101. That which knows or objectifies the empirical consciousness (Dharma Bhoota Jnaana) is the witnessing Pure or Absolute Consciousness alone :

To wit, when we are observing one-pointedly any one external object or when in our mind alone we are imagining any one matter we do not have any knowledge or consciousness whatsoever of the remaining objects. Similarly, to the person, who is intoxicated by consuming alcoholic liquor as well as to the person who suffers from the illness of delirium, does not have any knowledge or consciousness at all of what is happening outside themselves. In such circumstances it is not our opinion that there is no consciousness whatsoever; we think only that, as a result of the irregularity caused in the mind, "the consciousness having been suppressed remains stagnant in some region alone and it does not spread in other directions". Thus when we say in the manner — "consciousness exists", "consciousness does not exist" "consciousness is increased", "consciousness is decreased" etc. what meaning do we assume for the word 'consciousness'? Is it not in the manner — "To be conscious or to know is a quality in us, and we are the agents or possessors of that quality"? Therefore, this knowledge or consciousness which undergoes changes like increase and decrease etc. can be called **"Dharma Bhoota Jnaana" or the empirical knowledge or consciousness.**

We talk in terms of the empirical consciousness or knowledge and express in the manner — "Getting born", "Remaining dull", "Shining well", "Knowing

Rarest Archiver

an object" and then "Failing to know the object" etc.— is it not? In these circumstances who is it that knows (i.e. objectifies, envisages or visualizes) the changes of 'getting born', 'shining well' etc. of this empirical knowledge? We alone, is it not? If that is so, it means that in us too the Pure Consciousness which illumines this empirical consciousness or knowledge has to exist. Now let us deliberate or ratiocinate in a different manner. If the consciousness or knowledge — when it gets born, becomes dull, shines well and is undergoing various kinds of changes — were a quality of ours only, then we (as the possessors or agents of that quality) also should have been changing into different forms or conditions, is it not? It is an established popular fact that the possessor or agent of a quality, which is of an adventitious nature or of a nature of coming and going, undergoes a change. Because in our experience the empirical knowledge 'coming unto us' and 'slipping away from us' — all these are appearing, it will have to be said that we also are undergoing a change only when this empirical knowledge is the acquired. If this is true, will it not mean that at a particular time we will be completely destroyed or annihilated? People who say that *Atman* or the Self is agent or possessor of the quality of empirical knowledge or consciousness will have to acquiesce in or bow their heads before the logician who argues in the manner — "*Atman* is changing with the changes in empirical knowledge" — as also — "Therefore, He (*Atman*) must be non-eternal", For that reason alone, we have stated above that there is a danger in saying that the Consciousness or Knowledge of *Atman* is an adventitious quality or char-

Rarest Archives

acteristic. Anyone may ask — "Let there be any danger, but why should it not be said that in accordance with everyone's experience knowledge or consciousness is *Atman's* quality alone?" But this argument is not in keeping with experience. Therefore, it is not proper to say that Consciousness or Knowledge is *Atman's* quality. The question will then arise — "If the empirical knowledge which is a quality and its possessor, i. e. we, are both invariably changing, who is there knowing or objectifying this change?" **It is not possible for anyone to say that others are observing the changes occurring in us by empirical knowledge and that we can know from them; we ourselves are observing — that means, it becomes certain that by that innate nature with which we are observing or objectifying (Intuiting) all these changes, that innate nature alone is the real core or essence of Consciousness (i.e. Pure or Absolute Consciousness which is of the nature of Intuitive experience).** That which is being known or objectified — that is a mere appearance of knowledge or consciousness. Therefore, it will have to be decided that, just like the fire that appears in a piece of iron, the real Consciousness or Knowledge (i. e. Pure Consciousness of the Witness) appears in the empirical knowledges of the kind — 'I' and its 'quality', and really they are not by themselves of the innate nature of Knowledge or Consciousness. This strong logical device is also in consonance with everyone's experience, For, our absolute innate Being is Itself what we have previously (sub-sections 95-96) stated as **Saakshi Chaitanya** or **the Witnessing Pure Consciousness**, and with Its Intuitive Consciousness or Knowledge alone the inner instrument of mind and the senses, which are there in the waking, are 'shining or

Rarest Archives

glittering' as though imbued with Consciousness or Knowledge. **Just as the heat and light of the red hot iron belongs only to the fire, similarly the consciousness or knowledge that appears or is manifested in the inner instrument of the mind as well as in the senses is really of that of the Witness (i.e. Atman or the Self) alone.** For that reason alone, this Witness has been described in the *Upanishad* as — "It is the Mind which is the essence of the physical mind, It is the Ear which is the essence of the physical ear, It is the Speech which is the essence of the physical speech, It is the Life Force or Principle which is the essence of the physical life force, It is the Eye which is the essence of the physical eye"—(*Kena Upanishad* 1-1-2).

102. The Knowledge or Consciousness of the Witness is not mutable, not many in number, not endowed with objectivity or not having an object at all :

By this deliberation itself it becomes established that *Atman's* Knowledge or Consciousness is an Entity not having birth, not liable to change, not many, not having any object. For, the knowledge or consciousness that we think to be born is really not Knowledge or Consciousness at all. Whatever knowledge we may deem to have accrued to, or acquired by, us, but our real (i. e. essential nature of) Consciousness or Pure Consciousness of the Witness, which is knowing all that, cannot be said to be born. For, It knows the birth and growth, the changes or mutations of all kinds of scenes or visions. Let any number of knowledges seem to have occurred to us in the wak-

Rarest Archives

ing, at their base (as the substratum *par excellence*) there exists the one and only Consciousness or Knowledge of the Witness. In It there is no number, for It does not manifest Itself in time; It is an Entity which 'illumines and shows up' time also, and hence it is not possible to misconceive It and ask the question — "Is this Consciousness one or many?" It is **neither an object to anything whatsoever, nor It is in Itself a subject.** For, when we say that 'we know the Witness', we do not know It making It an object at all We know It by Pure, Absolute, Intuitive or Transcendental Consciousness (*Nirvikalpaanubhava*) alone which is beyond the ken of empirical knowledge or consciousness. Although our saying that — 'there is an object to the Witness'— is true from the empirical viewpoint, It does not 'know' any object whatsoever just as it is in the case of empirical knowledge which is of the nature of concepts only as when we say — "I am knowing this object". The empirical knowledge which is well-known or familiar in our day-to-day transactions cannot remain apart from the object at all, but the Knowledge or Consciousness of the Witness is not tied down at all to any object whatsoever. Even when we say that — "The Witness is knowing the state" — the state does not exist independently at all. Because we cognize, nay Intuit, the Knowledge or Consciousness of the Witness also in the Absolute or Transcendental nature of the Witness Itself, there does not occur any change whatsoever of the type of 'Knowing' in the Witness. If viewed in this sense, **the Consciousness or Knowledge of the Witness is not only Its very core of Being or essential, innate nature alone just like the light of the sun, but also It is an Entity having nothing else as second to It.**

Rarest Archiver

103. There is no object or entity whatsoever other than Pure Consciousness :

Here a doubt arises: When it is well-known that to *Atman's* Consciousness, i. e. to the Pure Consciousness of the Witness or the Self, the state as well as the existence of the world or universe within it is an object, how can it be said that Pure Consciousness has no object ? If it is contended that Pure Consciousness of *Atman* alone appears as the object, does not the objection raised against the theory or doctrine of those who say that mind or intellect itself appears as the object (i. e. just as the *Vijnaana Vaadins* or Idealists contend) confront you ? That same objection can be raised against the Vedantin's theory, is it not ? After having stated (sub — section 98) that in consciousness or knowledge there are three divisions, viz. *Paaramaarthika* or the Absolute or really real (Intuitive), *Vyaavahaarika* or consciousness or knowledge in the empirical workaday world and *Praatibhaasika* or the illusory, to say that — 'Everything is Pure or Absolute Consciousness of the Witness or Self alone'— is a contradiction of statements made previously and at present, is it not ? What is the difference between the theory that — 'Everything is mental or conceptual knowledge alone' — and your (i. e. Vedantin's) theory that — 'Everything is Pure or Absolute Consciousness of the Witness alone' ?

In order to provide a satisfactory solution for this doubt we have to take not only the waking state but also the dream and the deep sleep states for our examination ; previously (sub — section 59)

Rarest Archiver

when the same kind of objection had cropped up with regard to "Existence" what satisfactory solution was proffered — that should be remembered. The Witness is not tied down or confined to any state at all; just as It is the Witness for the waking when the latter is in 'front of It', in the same manner when the waking is not there any more and the dream is in 'front of It', to that state also It is the Witness. Irrespective of the number of times the waking and the dream appear, It, i.e. the Witnessing Pure Consciousness, is not only ready to 'illumine' them but also when they both are not there at all, without being under any obligation or influence of these, in the deep sleep state It exists by Itself *per se*, alone. But the waking and the dream are not like that; for their appearance the 'light of Pure Consciousness of the Witness' is invariably needed. When the light of the Witness is illumining the dream, neither the waking nor the deep sleep can ever appear or manifest themselves in any manner whatsoever. They then do not exist anywhere else at all. Therefore, the very life or existence of the states is dependent upon or in the control and command of the Witness. It being so, what is there to say about the dependence of the knowledge or consciousness that appears within the waking alone ?

104. The waking mind or intellect alone is responsible for the appearance of divisions in Pure or Absolute Consciousness :

If that is so, what is the reason for the Consciousness to appear as different in the forms of knowledge of a pot, knowledge of a fine cloth etc.

Rarest Archive

in the waking? Can it be said that one Consciousness alone is appearing in so many forms? Apart from this, as you yourself (Vedantin) have stated, the differences of the type of the Absolute or Pure Consciousness of the Witness or *Paaramaarthika*, the empirical or day-to-day or *Vyaavahaarika* knowledge of the rope and the illusory or *Praatibhaasika* knowledge of the rope-snake are appearing, is it not? How can it be known that in all these cases the knowledge or consciousness that appears is one and the same?"—In this manner anyone may ask. To this question also as previously (sub-section 60) with regard to "Existence" what answer was given—in the same manner with the help of the illustration of the dream an answer can be given. In the dream, knowledges of tha type of — 'I saw a pot', 'I saw a tree' — are gained or experienced. As soon as they are born, just as in the waking knowledge or consciousness alone, in those dream knowledges too the triad or *Triputi* of 'the knower,' 'the means of knowledge' and 'the known' appears; therein also it appears as if there are differences — of some knowledges being proper or correct knowledges and some others as being wrong knowledges. Even so, we do not believe that in the dream really these divisions exist whatsoever: we all know that all those are 'mere appearances' and that at that time they 'appeared to exist really'. At that moment also our Pure Consciousness alone is the proof or the witness to say that in the dream we are observing everything as the Witness or Pure Consciousness, the Self. If for both the states the Witness is not one and the same, then for the memory (sub-section 120) of the type of — 'I saw such and such a dream' to

Rarest Archives

occur there would have been no scope or room at all. Because it is certain that the Witness, having been one and the same in the dream as well as the waking, is illumining everything with the light of Pure Consciousness which is of a constant immutable nature, to say that — 'Although that Pure Consciousness exists by Itself alone, It can appear as different knowledges' — the experience of the dream alone gives enough strength. Although we cannot state the cause for the question as to why one Absolute or Pure Consciousness alone appeares in different forms, there does not remain any doubt whatsoever about the possibility of It appearing in that manner.

(C) Pure Or Absolute Consciousness Or Knowledge

105. In deep sleep everything has become Atman alone of the nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness or Knowledge :

If the experience of deep sleep is brought to mind, this idea or meaning is further strengthened. For, therein — just as in the waking and in the dream there exists a world before us — no world whatsoever exists before us; therefore, the triad or *Triputi* of 'I', knowledge or consciousness as the

Rarest Archives

means and the object of any kind whatever does not exist; hence, in Consciousness no division whatsoever of the types of 'the real' and 'the unreal' exists at all. Thus although the absence of the differences of the types — 'I', objects, knowledges, real and false — belonged to the state, there is no basis or support whatsoever to say that — 'There in deep sleep we ourselves did not exist or that our Consciousness disappeared'. For, then if there had been no Consciousness, there would have been no cause or ground at all for the scrutiny or examination of the fact of the experience of that state having occurred to us. Even if any one person without wisdom or discretion doubts in the manner — "In deep sleep I did not know anything whatsoever I" — it will amount to his saying that 'the object which he knew or was conscious of was not there only', but not that his Consciousness did not exist. For that reason alone, the *Upanishad* is stating: "In deep sleep when he is not knowing anything he exists endowed with Pure Consciousness alone; there cannot be any loss of the Consciousness of the Knower, is it not? For, It is indestructible. But because there (in deep sleep) there does not exist anything else apart from Itself or second to Itself, Pure Consciousness (of the Witness or *Saakshi*) does not know; only when there exists another object one can know, is it not?" — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-3-30). What has been described before (sub-section 61) during the consideration of the essential nature of deep sleep should be made applicable according to the context and relevance here also. There in deep sleep we do not exist in the form of 'I', but we exist in the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness of

Rarest Archive

the Witness. If observed more anlaytically or incisively, because there exists nothing whatsoever which is the witnessed (*Saakshya*) therein, even the statement that — 'We are the Witness there' — is also not the ultimate truth; therein we really exist as of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness alone. There in deep sleep **because the external object, the internal knowledge, the knowing 'I' — all have become one with the essential nature or core of Being of the Witness, existence and knowledge are existing together (or rather they have merged into one Entity) alone.** What we are seeing now — all that has become one with or merged in that Pure or Absolute Consciousness Itself; because apart from, or other than, that Pure or Absolute Consciousness there exists nothing else whatsoever, deep sleep is not a state (*Avastha*) at all — really speaking; it, i.e. deep sleep, is **Shuddha Chaitanya or Pure Absolute Consciousness alone, which neither exists within time, nor is It a certain type of appearance also of the Ultimate Reality or Brahman or Atman. That Pure or Absolute Consciousness of the Witness alone is the Ultimate Reality of all existence and knowledge.** Our calling deep sleep 'a state wherein nothing whatsoever is known' is from the waking viewpoint alone. (Saying that — 'In deep sleep the whole of the world of the nature of names and forms exists in the form of energy or force or *Shakti Roopa*' — is from the empirical viewpoint which imagines or conjectures that the divisions of names and forms, prejected by *Avidya* or Ignorance, to be real. Because names and forms are imagined or projected by *Mithyaa Jnaana* or misconception, imagining their energy or force — hypothetically — by reasoning or dialectic means

Rarest Archive

alone that also is from the viewpoint of that misconception alone — (*Sutra Bhashya* 2-1-9). When there does not exist either the empirical knowledge or the empirical object, who can know what? "When everything has become the very core or essence of *Atman* alone, there with what can be smelt what? There with what can be seen what? With what can be heard what? With what can be said about what? With what can be thought about what? — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 2-4-14) — Thus that is the essential nature alone which the *Upanishad* is stating. That is the very essence of the entire gamut of knowledge that we are perceiving; the distinctive or empirical knowledges that appear in the waking and the dream also are subsumed in that Pure or Absolute Consciousness of deep sleep; from that Pure Consciousness alone the knowledges of the three levels also, which we have stated before, are projected or manifested.

106. Why do people believe that deep sleep is a state of oblivion or forgetfulness?

Now it is essential to find out the answer to the question: "If deep sleep is, as stated above, really Pure Consciousness (*Shuddha Chaitanya*) alone, why have the people believed that in deep sleep there does not exist any knowledge or consciousness at all? Why has the belief that 'Deep sleep and obliviousness or forgetfulness mean one and the same thing' is spread among the common people?" Before an answer is given to this question, we must ask ourselves another question — "In common parlance what do the people call experience (knowledge)?"

Rarest Archives

The distinctive or empirical knowledge that appears in the waking as well as in the dream alone, is it not? No one ever thinks that this kind of distinctive knowledge of dream or of the waking exists in deep sleep. For, in the dream as well as in the waking the experiences and the memories of some objects keep on occurring to us. Therein we keep on making certain resolutions and actions; by that therein feelings of the kind — fear (*Bhaya*), elation (*Harsha*), excitement (*Udvega*), liking or attachment (*Raaga*), dislike or hatred (*Dvesha*), happiness or pleasure (*Sukha*), misery or grief (*Dukha*) etc. — are born. But if deep sleep is observed, there is no trace whatsoever of these. Therein either the divisions of the type — 'I', 'another', or the knowledges or memories arising out of those divisions; or resolutions (or volitions) and actions; or elation, excitement, pleasure and pain — not an iota of these exist. 1) To call a state or condition in which there is no knowledge or memory of any object whatsoever or there is no feeling whatsoever arising in the mind — 'a state of forgetfulness or obliviousness or stupor' — is a prevalent convention or practice among common people (*Loka Roodhi*). If any person is not knowing any topic well, the others ask him — "What is this, are you sleeping?" Therefore, it is but natural for people who have deep-seated identification with the waking alone to call deep sleep 'forgetfulness, stupor'. Apart from this, in the waking our body, senses and mind are always existing only. When these are healthy only and are carrying on their respective functions, we get the knowledge of the external objects; when these instruments of knowledge are not performing functions because of certain tiredness or fatigue, we do not find any knowledge whatsoever occurring to

Rarest Archives

us. In the same way, therefore, (2) because in deep sleep the body, the senses and the mind are not functioning, it appears to be reasonable to assume that 'therein there is no knowledge whatsoever; it is a state of obliviousness or forgetfulness' There is a strong reason to imagine that the other people who are in front of us and who are carrying on transactions with us are also endowed with knowledge only when they are using their body and senses. For, when they go to sleep before our eyes and after waking up they say that during their sleep no event whatsoever among those that were perceived by us was known or experienced by them; similarly, when we are asleep, those who are awake too state that they saw so many events which we had not known at that time. For this reason also, it is but natural for people to think that the knowledge accruing through the body and the senses exists in the waking alone and that because that knowledge does not exist in deep sleep, to believe that that state to be 'a state of obliviousness or forgetfulness alone' is proper.

In spite of this being so, because the above verdict or judgment which the people have made on the basis of their identification with the waking is opposed to the philosophical teaching (*Siddhaanta*) based on the comprehensive or plenary knowledge arising out of the examination of the three states, it is proper (reasonable) to reject the common people's verdict. For, the phenomenon of our perceiving those who are going to sleep in our presence belongs to our waking alone that does not render any help whatsoever to

Rarest Archive

the consideration of deep sleep experience (sub-section 33). Through the belief that 'while we are sleeping, outside there are those who are awake' is enough for the waking viewpoint, because it is a judgement made without taking into the reckoning the experience of the deep sleep, it cannot be of any utility in the matter of the determination of the Ultimate Reality (Sub-section 30). If the experience of deep sleep is observed with cocentration — just as it is experienced therein — then it appears that in that state we do not have any instruments of knowledge whatsoever of the type — the body, the senses, the mind etc. — and that, even so, we keep on getting the experience of the deep sleep indeed. To which category does this 'experience' of deep sleep belong? It is not an experience with distictive features (*Savikalpa*) of the type — "This is such and such a thing" — like the knowledge of an object; nor is it memory also, not a volition too, it is not a thing which is born, not anything which grows, not that which vanishes or is destroyed. By that there is neither elation nor grief, nor any other kind of emotion or feeling — non of these is produced. Even so, it is not possible for anyone to say that this Knowledge or Consciousness does not exist. If that is not existing (i.e. not an entity at all), how is it possible to say that — 'Then we did not know anything whatsoever'? This Knowledge or Consciousness is one which does not have any contact whatsoever with anything else, meaning It is the Absolute or Transcendental Pure Knowledge or Consciousness, which desiderates neither any support (or substrate) nor any object or entity other than, or second to, It. Therefore, there is no cause whatsoever to divide in the

Rarest Archive

manner — "Deep sleep is a state of obliviousness or forgetfulness and that waking and dream are states with knowledge or consciousness". **In deep sleep too, just as in the waking and the dream, the Pure Knowledge or Consciousness which is the Ultimate Reality is invariably existing; the distinctive or empirical knowledges which are supposed to appear in the waking, being of the essential nature alone of Pure Consciousness or Knowledge, are the phenomena which are sprouting from It alone and are appearing.** This alone is the philosophical teaching or truth.

107. The meaning of the statement that the empirical or distinctive knowledges (Dharma Bhoota Jnaana) are not existing in deep sleep :

Here a doubt may arise : Let it be that deep sleep is not at all obliviousness ; let us also agree that in it Pure Consciousness exists. However, it does appear to be proper especially to say that all of us get transformed back into the form of Pure Consciousness in deep sleep and that in It alone all our present knowledges are merged or have become one with It. For, you yourself have stated ; "In the waking the phenomenon of empirical knowledge shines, having been attached to the 'I' notion ; the whole of the waking state is illumined by the *Saakshi* or the Witness." If Pure Consciousness, which is our essential nature of Being, is in the Witness — it may even exist in the deep sleep also. But merely on that account, how can it be said that our empirical or distinctive objective knowledges too enter it (i. e. deep sleep) and become

Rarest Archives

one with it? It is true that when we go to sleep, our knowledges disappear. For that the reason is only that the mind and the senses remain without functioning, but that all those knowledges enter and become one with Pure Consciousness — just like the rivers go and fall into the sea — is not at all the reason. Whoever has got the experience either of the empirical or distinctive knowledges entering and becoming one with Pure Consciousness during the time of deep sleep or when the waking consciousness arises those distinctive empirical knowledges having emerged from Pure Consciousness? Apart from this, in the waking besides our knowledges the objects as well as the instruments of knowledge exist separately In deep sleep where do all those things go? Will it be proper to believe that they also invariably become one with Pure Consciousness (*Shuddha Chaitanya*) alone? Can it be believed that Pure Consciousness alone which exists in deep sleep splits up in the waking into 'the instruments of knowledge', 'the distinctive knowledges' and 'the objects'? Knowledge or Consciousness is not gross, the object is not Knowledge or Consciousness; how can there be a cause-effect relationship between these two which are extermely different (or of contradictory natures)?

Here also what we have previously (sub-section 62) stated in connection with the consideration of "Existence" must be remembered. When we are asleep, no one among us think that the dream knowledges and objects exist separately. There is no evidence whatsoever to say that they exist apart from our *Atman* or the Self. Because we have shown elaborately that there is no

Rarest Archives

difference whatsoever between the dream and the waking with regard to their 'existence' (sub-section 71 to 81), it is unreasonable or irrational to think that the waking knowledges as well as objects cannot become one with Pure Consciousness in deep sleep and that they exist separately somewhere. As we have already (sub-section 62) stated all that is needed to be explained in this matter, there is no benefit in giving the same answer once more. To the objection — "There is no experience to the effect that our knowledges and their objects having entered in us during deep sleep and becoming one with it, is it not?" — also, an answer similar to the one which has been given there in that context alone should be imagined or conceived. Now the answer to the question — "Because the objects are of quite different or queer nature other than Pure Knowledge or Consciousness, how can we believe that Pure Consciousness alone has split up into distinctive knowledges and objects?" — is as follows : We do not say at all that from the Pure Consciousness the empirical or distinctive knowledges and their objects are born or have emerged out. There is no cause-effect relationship whatsoever between Pure Consciousness and the empirical knowledges ; we are transacting or dealing with, from the waking viewpoint, Pure Consciousness alone as 'distinctive knowledges and objects', **but apart from Atman or the Self or Witness who is in the form of Pure Consciousness there never existed any knowledge or object whatsoever.** Because Pure Consciousness that exists in deep sleep is Itself existing without change in the form of the Witness in the waking too, the empirical or distinctive knowledges and objects which appear as Its 'witnessed objects' (*Saakshya*) are, really from Its point of view, not existing

Rarest Archive

at all. Both of them (i. e. the distinctive knowledges and the objects) are delusory alone. It is true that as usual the objects as well as the senses are appearing in the waking ; it is also true that the belief to the effect — "I myself am knowing with the senses, which I had used yesterday, the same objects" — is deeply ingrained in us and looms large before us too. But all this is the knowledge that has accrued on seeing from the waking viewpoint. Though this may suit the waking, it is never capable of either refuting the deep sleep experience or rescind (strike down) the judgment arrived at by the comprehensive Intuitive experience of the three states. The worth of the belief — ' The same senses, the same objects" — can be determined by the consideration or deliberation followed with regard to the belief of the type — "The same world is this" — which we have adopted previously (sub-section 62). If it is determined in that manner, because that belief is vitiated by the waking viewpoint, immediately it will flash that that belief is never opposed to the plenary or comprehensive Intuitive experience. Therefore, it does not amount to any harm being done to the philosophical truth — 'Everything is Pure Consciousness alone'.

108. The distinctive or empirical knowledges do not exist apart from Pure Consciousness:

Because of the assumption alone that the empirical knowledges which are there in the waking are separate, the question as to what happens to them in deep sleep arises. Even if it is accepted that in the waking we do have the distinctive knowledges, to

Rarest Archive

know their birth and growth the Pure Knowledge or Consciousness, which is our core of Being, is perforce required. Because this essential nature of our Being exists invariably in deep sleep also and because even though the other knowledges are manifested in the waking and the dream they are confined or tied down to their respective states alone, it becomes established that the essential nature of Pure Consciousness alone is the essence of the distinctive or empirical knowledges as well as their objects. To wit, because the Ultimate Reality must ever exist only, deep sleep or our essential nature of Consciousness, called *Shuddha Chaitanya* or Pure (Absolute) Consciousness, will become the essence or core of the Ultimate Reality; this our essential nature of Consciousness alone called *Shuddha Chaitanya* or Pure Consciousness — it becomes tantamount to — is the essence or core of the Ultimate Reality This *Shuddha Chaitanya* will be equivalent to every one of — 'the Witness or *Saakshi* who is in the waking and the dream', 'the distinctive or empirical knowledges, their objects', 'the senses'; but even then, the Witness or *Saakshi*, being of the essential nature of Consciousness alone, exists in that form or nature only and thereby the distinctive knowledges, the objects and the senses become zero in value in their respective forms; that means, it is tantamount to saying that they do not at all exist apart from the essential nature of Pure Consciousness.

This is a logical device which is arrived at on the strength of the experience which agrees with the consideration or examination of the three states. But if only the waking alone is taken into the reckoning

Rarest Archives

and in keeping with the experiences that occur therein if the deliberation is carried out, does it become established that therein apart from the essential nature of Pure Consciousness there exists a phenomenon called distinctive or empirical knowledge? It is proper for us to deliberate upon this question. There does not seem to be any support whatsoever therein to divide Consciousness into two parts in this manner. To wit, in the instance of our saying — "Knowledge is born and has vanished or disappeared" — what is it that was born and that which has disappeared? Was the knowledge itself born and did it disappear? To say like that what authority or support do we have? This problem we should discern with all concentration or alertness. There is no possibility of, or scope for, the birth and disappearance of knowledge being perceived by that very knowledge itself; it is quite clear indeed that because before being born and after disappearance too it (knowledge) is itself not existing, that knowledge cannot itself know its birth as well as disappearance. Therefore, as stated above, it will have to be accepted that in order to know the birth and the disappearance of the distinctive knowledges etc. our essential nature of Pure Consciousness alone is needed. If this is true, then can that essential nature of Pure Consciousness Itself not know the objects too? How much will it be reasonable to think that while the distinctive or empirical knowledge itself — just then born — has the strength or capacity of knowing, the ever-existing essential nature of Pure Consciousness Itself does not have this strength or capacity? This we must deliberate upon. No one should doubt in the manner — "When the birth and destruction or disappearance of knowledge is in experience, what

Rarest Archive

purpose is served by this deliberation?" By the contact or relationship of the object some thoughts or ideations or Vrittis (changes) occur in the mind and this is indeed in the experience of everyone of us. But merely on that count is there any support to imagine that Knowledge or Consciousness is of two kinds, viz. one which is of the essential nature and one which is empirical or distinctive, and that those two kinds of Consciousness have a relationship of — 'the knowledge and the known' - and that by the function of the gross instruments or senses the empirical knowledge is produced? Is it not proper or reasonable to say that all these are the misconceptions alone that we have formed with regard to the essential nature of Consciousness? The sun is of the essential nature of light alone, he also illumines the objects which come before him; but while illumining in that manner, does any change whatsoever occur in his essential nature of light? No. Similarly, our essential nature of Consciousness or Pure Consciousness is the 'light of knowledge'. It illumines the form of the object which comes or appears before It; at that moment, why should any change occur at all in It? If the flitting clouds appear in one part of the sky and move to another side, how much proper will it be to imagine or think that in the essential nature itself of the sun, who illumines their (i.e. of the clouds) coming and going, those changes of coming and going are occurring? That much proper indeed will it be to conceive or imagine that by the birth and disappearance of the thoughts or ideations these changes of birth and disappearance are occurring in the essential nature of Pure Consciousness Itself. The knowledge that manifests because of the adjunct of thought may get the nomen-

Rarest Archive

clature or appellation of **Vritti Jnaana or conceptual knowledge**; by virtue of the birth and disappearance of *Vrittis* or thoughts (concepts) there can also arise empirical dealings of the type — ' The concepts are born and are destroyed or they have disappeared. But this empirical dealing is in the secondary sense alone and not in a predominant sense. "Rama Rao, who had sported a moustache, has disappeared; in his place now exists, Satyaanand Swami" — in this manner there is a practice or convention of saying things about one and the same individual, is it not? In this dealing, really the individual by name — 'Rama Rao' — himself has not disappeared, but his features or adjuncts like moustache etc. alone have disappeared. In the same manner, here also because the *Vritti* or concept which is **the Upaadhi or adjunct** or a special feature of empirical knowledge has disappeared, there can also be an empirical transaction of the type — 'The knowledge that was **Upahita or conjoined with an adjunct or special, feature** has disappeared'. But the change or mutation of the adjunct or special feature called *Vritti* or concept, which is useful in determining the Consciousness, is not in the least related to the Consciousness that appears to be conjoined with the adjunct or special feature.

To those who are having immense identification with the waking state alone the above philosophical teaching, all of a sudden, does not become agreeable or acceptable. Because they are observing by keeping the waking experience alone which arises in the form of — "I got the knowledge of this" — as important, to them the fact that — "The self who is the

Rarest Archive

substrate for the knowledge, i. e. the knower or Jnaatru is separate ; apart from him the brilliance or splendour of knowledge or Jnaana Prabha, which now and then manifests, is itself separate, and when that 'brilliance of knowledge or consciousness' touches the object, the 'Jnapti' or the resultant knowledge that arises in the knower himself is separate" — appears more trustworthy. Therefore, they can even reckon that the phenomenon of knowledge is a certain power that is existing in us and further that it can be assumed that being unmanifested in the deep sleep it becomes .manifested in the waking and the dream. But to those who assume that — "Just as the manner in which the differences *Jnaana* or instruments of knowledge, *Jnaatru* or the knower, *Jnapti* or the resultant knowledge appear in the empirical dealings, in the same manner alone the yexist" — i.e. as absolutely true, the difficulties that are met with or encountered while considering the essential nature of knowledge, its production or birth, its substrate etc. we have previously itself (sub-sections 90, 91, 92) mentioned. We have also mentioned above the facility or convenience that exists in the theory that 'Knowledge is one and one alone. Just as in order to know the birth and disappearance of knowledge another knowledge is required, in the same way in order to know the empirical states of manifestation and unmanifestation also another knowledge is perforce required. Here when the essential nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness Itself, which both have agreed upon, is enough to illumine the object, and further in that Pure Consciousness alone, by virtue of the apparent association with the adjunct (*Upaadhi*), *'Jnaatrutwa'* or 'knowerhood', *'Jnaanatwa'* or the phenomenon of the means

Rarest Archive

of knowledge', *'Jnaptitwa'* or 'the phenomenon of resultant knowledge', *'Vyaktatwa'* or 'manifestness', *'Avyaktatwa'* or 'unmanifestness' etc. — such transactions can take place, it is clear that the greater defect of conceiving the manifoldness of Knowledge becomes unavoidable for the protagonists of empirical knowledge. Just as although the sun himself is of the essential nature of light, he has rays which are of the nature of light, *Atman* who is of the essential nature of Knowledge or Consciousness alone, why should not He have 'rays' of the nature of Knowledge or Consciousness? — in this manner some people doubt. But here there is no proper relevance between the illustration and the illustrated. The sun and his brilliance — all are one object called 'light' alone. The scientists have decided that for the sun's brilliant rays of light to come and reach our earth planet a certain period of time is required, and that for a long time if he keeps on sending the rays in the same way, in the end the solar system itself will become extinct. But the consideration of *Atman* or the Self, which is the illustrated, is not so; He is not a matter or substance of knowledge, nor is He a conglomeration of parts or constituents. *Atman*, i.e. Pure or Absolute Consciousness, the Witnessing Principle, is one who is of the essential nature of objectifying and illumining all objects with divisions or differences of the type of — *Dravya* or substance, *Guna* or quality, *Avayava* or parts or constituents, *Jaati* or species, *Vyakti* or individual member etc. and one who is extremely of a different nature altogether from that of all such things. Therefore, imagining or conceiving that from the knower or *Jnaatru* the rays of knowledge or *Jnaana Kiranas* are emerging out, and superimposing on *Atman* or the Self

Rarest Archive

(of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness) the changes that arise in empirical knowledge like increasing, decreasing, expanding or spreading, contracting or shrinking, getting born, getting destroyed etc. — these are acceptable only to the minds of infants or puerile intellects who have a well-known power of imagination, and not to the examiners of the Ultimate Reality who can carry out high and subtle ratiocination or Intuitive reasoning based on or in accordance with Intuitive experience. From all these accounts and arguments, it becomes evident that it is wrong only to think that Knowledge or Consciousness is a *Shakti* or power. Therefore, it is established as indisputable the fact that there is no manifoldness in Knowledge or Consciousness as well as the fact that there is no difference whatsoever between the essential nature of Pure Consciousness that exists in deep sleep and the empirical or distinctive knowledges which we imagine or conceive to appear or manifest in the waking in their absolute or really real nature.

(D) The Different Forms Of Knowledge Or Consciousness

109. The theory of Atman being Pure or Absolute Consciousness is not contradictory or opposed to the theory of the three levels of knowledge :

Now for the doubt (sub - section 103) of the type — "The theory that Pure Knowledge or Consciousness of *Atman* alone is all the knowledge that exists

Rarest Archiver

in the world is contradictory or opposed to the statement that there are three levels or grades in knowledge or consciousness, is it not?" — an answer seems to have been found. For, *Atman* or our essential nature of Pure Consciousness and the states of waking and dream are not different. *Atman* Himself is, in fact, these states, the distinctive knowledges, objects and senses that exist in these states as well as the intellect or mind which indicates or depicts this division of states etc. Therefore, the Pure or Absolute Consciousness alone is appearing as the knowledge or consciousness with three levels or grades. **Atman's Pure Consciousness is absolutely or really real (Paaramaarthika), the knowledge of the states is empirical (Vyaavahaarika), the delusions are illusory (Praatibhaasika) — all these statements are the divisions formulated or systamatized for the benefit (sake) of people who observe Pure Consciousness from the waking viewpoint or standpoint; in reality, everything is Pure or Absolute Consciousness alone.** In this regard, previously (sub-section 64) what has been stated on the topic of Pure Existence — that the readers must once again bring before their mind.

110. The logic or dialectics of the waking can never become a hindrance or it cannot harm the philosophical teaching or truth that Pure Consciousness is one and one alone :

In that case, how can it be proper to say that — "One Consciousness alone exists as Consciousness, as also It has acquired the forms of consciousness of the waking and the dream" ? Apart from this, look at the magnitude of difference between these two kinds of knowledges or forms of consciousness : The consci-

Rarest Archive

ousness that exists in deep sleep is of one kind alone; in it there is no increase or decrease whatsoever; in it there are no birth and disappearance, no manifoldness, no difference, no concepts of 'features or characteristics' and 'the entity endowed with such features' (*Dharma Dharmee Bhaava*), no concepts of 'the rescinding agent' and 'the rescinded' or 'the falsifying agent' and 'the falsified entities' (*Baadhaka Baadhya Bhaava*). In the consciousnesses of the waking and the dream all these exist. The waking knowledge or consciousness keeps on growing only; in each person it exists in a certain quantum; in each race or generation it exists at a particular level. How did such two extremely different natures or forms arise in one Consciousness alone? For this objection too what answer we have stated previously (sub-sections 65, 66) with regard to the topic of Pure Existence should be once again ruminated over repeatedly. For all the objections raised here the logic based on the waking viewpoint alone is the cause. When Pure or Absolute Consciousness having 'acquired' different forms is in our comprehensive or Intuitive experience, there is no room whatsoever for an objection of the type — "Can it happen in this manner?" We have already (sub-section 107) indicated that the statement to the effect — 'The Pure Consciousness had acquired different forms' — is not made by accepting the concept of cause-effect. The illusory forms (*Vivarta*) or misconceptions of Pure Consciousness alone are the waking and the dream and the distinctive knowledges which exist in them. Thus by the statement — 'Pure Consciousness alone acquires all the illusory forms' — there is no stigma or obloquy whatever attaching itself to Pure Consciousness. The *Aitareya Upanishad* has

Rarest Archive

described at length the various manifestations of Pure Consciousness in the following manner: "In locations or globes like the eyes, ears, nose, speech, tongue etc. what manifests is all the *'Hridaya'* or heart alone, the mind alone; the knowledge or consciousness which appears or manifests with the adjuncts of the mental thoughts or ideations, called the objects (*Samjnaana*), the egoistic knowledge of the type — 'I am independent' (*Ajnaana*), the knowledge of fine arts etc. (*Vijnaana*) knowing comprehensively (*Prajnaana*), the knowledge of remembering a text (*Medhaa*), knowing the objects through the senses (*Drishti*), the knowledge or consciousness which maintains or sustains the body and the senses and not allowing them to decay or emaciate (*Dhriti*), the knowledge or consciousness of the form of deliberation or discrimination (*Mati*), the knowledge or consciousness of the *Kartrutwa* or agentship engaged in deliberation (*Maneeshaa*), the knowledge or consciousness which experiences misery (*Jooti*), the consciousness or knowledge of the type of 'memory' (*Smriti*), the distinguishing knowledge of the type — 'this is white, that is black' (*Sankalpa*), the consciousness which determines (*Kratu*), the consciousness which manifests in acts or attempts to keep alive (*Asu*), the consciousness of desire (*Kaama*), blending or mixing (*Vasha*)" — all these are names of Pure Consciousness alone (*Aitareya Upanishad* 3-1, 2-3). Why speak more? "*Brahma, Indra,* the deities of *Prajaapati,* the five elements, the movable and the immovable creatures — everything is this Pure Consciousness alone."— (*Aitareya Upanishad* 3-3). Even if Pure Consciousness manifests with many different adjuncts like the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect, the ego etc., It exists as one immutable Entity alone; the

Rarest Archive

Upaadhi or adjunct (special feature) and *Upahita* or the entity endowed with the adjunct or special feature — this division too is that Pure Consciousness alone. Everything is Pure Consciousness, alone which is eternally indivisible, devoid of differences, devoid of objects, and apart from It there does not exist anything else at all.

(E) The Divisions of Correct Knowledge and Misconception or Wrong Knowledge

111. The hollowness or worthlessness of objections which are raised from the waking viewpoint against the theory that 'Pure Consciousness alone exists' :

Now we have to face yet another objection : "If everything is Pure Consciousness alone, how did the divisions of existence and knowledge arise ? 'The knowing Witness', 'the known state' - assuming these divisions alone you are carrying on the deliberation, is it not ? First of all, how at all did these divisions come about ? From the Pure Consciousness how did two entirely or extremely different knowledges of the states like waking and dream split up or spring up ? Although you have been saying that there is no difference whatsoever between the knowledge or consciousness

Rarest Archive

of the waking and the knowledge or consciousness of the dream, why is it that to the people it invariably appears that the knowledge of the waking is proper or genuine, while the dream knowledge is a mere delusion? In the waking, in addition to the knowledges of the substances, qualities etc. appearing invariably as different, why is it that among the knowledges of those things some appear to be true or proper and some others to be wrong or false? The waking consciousness keeps on telling us that the world exists subject to rules and regulations alone. But the dream consciousness is not like that. Apart from this, it can be stated that in the dream — more than an organized or regulated order of knowledge accruing to us — the power of imagination alone is predominantly having a merry dance. Thus the separation or division of knowledge and existence, the division of the state and its knowledge, the division of the knowledges of various kinds of subjects, the division of true and false knowledges — all these are in everyone's experience. Is it proper or reasonable to refute or discard them?"

Because we have previously (sub-section 67) raised the same kind of objection, as raised here, with regard to Pure Existence too and have indicated a solution in detail, really there is no need at all to provide once more a solution to this objection. Even so, in order to add some more explanations which have to be mentioned from the viewpoint of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness, we have once again raised these objections here. Pure Consciousness is not one, nor many ; in It there is no numeration at all. Therefore, from Its viewpoint neither the states nor the appearing knowledges can be reckoned as second to It at all. From that

Rarest Archive

viewpoint (of Pure Consciousness) the statements that — 'The knowledges of the states are three in number' and that — 'Within the states distinctive knowledges appear or manifest themselves' — are not at all proper or reasonable. Here the most important thing that we have to keep in memory is : **In all such ways the cause for our having entertained a divisive mind is our following the dictates of the waking mind alone.**

112. The waking mind or intellect cannot determine the essential nature of the knowledges of the waking :

There is yet another logical device also to prove the veracity of the statement that — "Whether it is the division of the knowledges that accrue to us in the waking world or whether it is the other divisions, *neither of them can cause any harm whatsoever to the* philosophical truth which states that Pure Consciousness is *immutable or indivisible, unitary Entity".* If the question — "What is the essential nature of the distinctive knowledges which appear in the waking ?" — is put to the mind, it immediately assumes silence. Because we have previously (sub-section 69) known by detailed examination the dullness that the waking mind begets when we undertake to determine the essential natures of the division of 'I' and' the rest', as also of the divisions of substance, quality etc., if in the case of the division of their knowledges too the mind is seen to get enveloped by the same kind of dullness or stupor, what wonder can there be ? When there does not exist any division in the object, then there is no cause at all for any division in its knowledge or consciousness. Our carrying out transactions of the

Rarest Archive

type — 'the knowledge of a stone', 'the knowledge of sand', 'the knowledge of a tree', 'the knowledge of a house' etc. is due to the division of the objects like stone, sand etc. alone, but any divisions in the essential nature of their knowledge being perceivable is not in our experience. If the objects are discarded, to distinguish and to know in the manner — 'one knowledge','another knowledge' — there is no feature whatsoever for us to see in Pure Consciousness. Even to imagine that there is a special feature or characteristic in Pure Consciousness the help of Pure Consciousness alone is needed and hence what is imagined in that manner as a special feature does not become a characteristic or quality of Pure Consciousness; instead, it becomes an object alone external to Pure Consciousness. Therefore, it becomes evident that in Pure Consciousness 'variety, divisibility or manifoldness' has to 'arise' from the object alone; but there is no room at all for any of them to arise in and by themselves. But when it is known that the essential nature of any object whatever is never capable of remaining steady to be cognized, how can at all its variety or manifoldness or divisibility be determined? If that object is not there, how can the varieties in Pure Consciousness be decided? Some readers may think; "To say that — 'The essential nature of objects is not possible to be decided' — is insolence or an overbearing attitude, and that if one cannot state the characteristics of objects, it may be possible to do so by another person; and further, just by merely searching for and showing the defects in the characteristics which some certain people have stated, it cannot be asserted that the objects do not have characteristics at all". But the inability to 'purify or refine' the characteristics of the various

Rarest Archive

visions or perceptions that appear to us in the waking is not because of the weakness of the examiners; the essential nature of the visions or perceptions is itself like that. Those who wish to get further clarification about the fact that this defect lies in the very nature itself of the visions or perceptions (or appearances) and that the characteristic features which we formulate in the waking by the logic-prone intellect can never reach finality, should read the book— "Appearance and Reality" by Bradley, or the Sanskrit books like Sri Harsha's *"Khandana Khanda Khaadya"*, Nrisimhaashrama Swami's *"Bheda Dhikkaara"*, Chitsukhaachaarya's *"Advaita Deepike"*, Anandagiri's *"Tarka Sangraha"*. Let it be. To cognize that there cannot be really any division whatsoever in Pure Consciousness (*Jnaana*) we have the support of another experience too. That is: It is possible for us to consider or deliberate upon any object by dividing it into various parts; but Consciousness, especially, we cannot at all divide in that manner. Even if we make any kind of the minutest or subtlest division as the object, to know or become conscious of it the whole Consciousness, i. e. Pure Consciousness or Intuitive experience, alone is needed; when Consciousness rolls or shifts over from one division or part to another division or part, It has 'to put out its step', so to speak, with Its complete or consummate (plenary) form alone, but it is not possible for Pure Consciousness to leave behind a little of Itself in this one part and then 'stretch out Its foot or tentacles' by taking the remaining stuff to the other division or part. It is true that we come to see some persons, like *'Ashtaavadhaanis'* or those persons who can memorize eight different objects or subject-matters at one and the same time or *'Shataavadhaanis'* or those

Rarest Archives

persons who can memorize hundred different things at one and the same time, who are gifted with the ability of concentrating at one and the same time on many things or subject - matters and objectify them simultaneously. But in their case too we have to say that — the power of concentration runs or flows so fast alone. However, to think that they know or become conscious of everything all at one and the same time cannot be proper or reasonable. That becomes evident to each by his own experiences alone. Is this experience not a strong means or evidence to say that in Pure Consciousness there does not exist any divisions or parts whatsoever ?

113. All the divisions that appear in Pure Consciousness are Maayic or illusory :

This much is established by the consideration made so far : It is true that in the waking the knowledges appear to be different or various ; but this is the decision made by the waking mind or intellect. Whatever knowledge accrues in the waking, the mind keeps on saying that all that is 'knowledge' alone. 'The knowledge of the rope-snake', 'the knowledge of the rope' .... both are knowledges only ; 'what I am stating now alone is the real knowledge' in this manner alone the mind keeps on saying. In these circumstances without the knowledge or consciousness changing, only the object of knowledge keeps on changing. 'I had assumed it to be like this, really that is like this' – in this way alone the mind or intellect indicates to us. The Meemaamsakas say : "All knowledge is certain with regard to the agent (*Dharmi*) who possesses the characteristic of knowledge, but in respect of it being 'such and such'

Rarest Archive

only there is delusion". This is certainly in agreement with experience indeed. Therefore, consciousness in its own essential nature exists as Consciousness alone; it never exists as delusion. With regard to names and forms only some changes of knowledge may occur; 'those objects even at the time of their being known did not exist at all' in this manner too it may flash to our experience. 'I did not know the snake' in this manner a second knowledge does not accrue to me at all. 'I had assumed it to be a snake, but really it is a rope' this alone is the form of knowledge which destroys or strikes down the previous knowledge. From this it becomes clear that even in delusion Consciousness has not changed its own essential form at all. If one brings to mind the fact that names and forms are illusory (*Maayic*) appearances, it becomes clear-cut that merely because of objectifying them (i.e. names and forms) it does not become tantamount to saying that there was any harm done to the purity of Consciousness. Even then, Pure Consciousness is one alone, non-dual (without a second)' — this philosophical truth alone stands or is sustained. This same answer is enough to the question — "How were the two mutually different or queer knowledges or consciousnesses like 'waking' and 'dream' produced from Pure Consciousness?" For, here the states themselves are the illusory visions or appearances. In Pure Consciousness no change whatsoever has taken place at all. That exists eternally or always as one alone — Pure or Absolute (i e. beyond the purview of the time-space-causation categories). **No verdigris or taint whatsoever of the states attaches itself to Pure Consciousness. The experience that 'no part or aspect of one state exists in the least in another' alone is the authoritative support to this our statement.**

Rarest Archive

(F) The Consciousness of Waking And Dream Is One And The Same

114. The necessity of the consideration of the comparison between the consciousnesses or knowledges of waking and dream :

Now the question — "If thus Pure Consciousness is really one alone, why is it that the waking consciousness or knowledge seems to be true to us while the (dream) knowledge or consciousness seems to be delusory? Why is it that in the dream, instead of a regulated knowledge like the one in the waking being produced, it looks as though the power of imagination alone is wildly dancing?" (sub-section 111) — has to be tàken up for deliberation, is it not? In this regard reading once again what has been stated in connection with the consideration of Pure Existence (sub-sections 71-81) will be highly beneficial to the readers. For, Pure Consciousness and Pure Existence are one and the same and hence all that has been stated there with regard to Pure Existence can be applied here also, according to the context, in the case of Pure Consciousness. By that consideration alone not only will it be cognized that our *Atman* or Self Himself, who is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness, is appearing to the waking mind or intellect as if He is split up into the states of waking and dream but also the comparisons that appear to exist between waking and dream 'will fully spread out and show up their roots' to be comprehended by the mind (i. e. the cause for this phenomenon will be fully discerned). Now we will

Rarest Archive

remove the differences that may appear between the waking and the dream when seen from the waking viewpoint and will present before the readers for their examination some subtler or more powerful reasonings which are required to reckon, from the Absolute viewpoint of the Pure Consciousness (i. e. the viewpoint of the Witness, the Self), the fact that 'both of them are one and the same only'. By these not only the *prima facie* objections are refuted or repudiated but also the philosophical truth that — 'In Pure Consciousness really there does not exist at all any division or distinction whatsoever' — is strengthened.

115. The belief of difference of the type .... 'the knowledge of waking is of a true nature, while the knowledge of dream is delusory' .... is not proper :

To people who say that dream knowledge is delusory a question is to be put and that is : "Delusion is a phenomenon which occurs on account of the subtle impressions formed from a certain past experience, is it not? Of which previous experience of such a kind should the delusions of dream be conceived to be the effect of subtle impressions?" We have previously (sub-sections 73-75) indicated some difficulties with regard to the opinion that by the latent impressions (*Vaasanas*) alone of the waking the dreams occur. Now we have to indicate yet another impediment confronting that opinion. That is : There is a regulation that the phenomena like - "The previous experience, the subtle impression caused by it, the delusion caused by that subtle impression, the right knowledge that falsifies or removes that delusion"— all these must belong to one and the same time series

Rarest Archive

or flux of time and must occur one after the other in that order ; because all these have to occur within the same internal instrument, i. e. the mind, at the time of the delusion also the memory of the previous experience remains or subsists. Boys try to eat crystals of alum owing to misconception of the type — 'Look, the crystal sugar which I ate before is here' — is it not ? But the experience of the dream is not in agreement with this regulation. There, even the least bit of the waking memory does not at all remain (sub-section 117) ; the waking experience, the dream experience and the waking experience which we believe to cancel or falsify the dream experience — all these do not at all belong to one and the same time series or flow. Because we do not at all think about the dream objects in the manner — "These are like the objects which we had seen in the waking" — dream cannot be said to be the delusion of knowing or taking one thing to be something else (*Saadhisthlıaana Bhraanti*). In the dream, for the appearances which we say that they appear because of our delusion — just like the nacre or sea-shell being the substratum for the appearance of silver or the rope being the substratum for the appearance of the rope-snake — there does not exist any real object whatsoever as a substrate therein at all. It is true that in the dream we get a knowledge as if we are seeing some people — those alone whom we had seen in the waking — as well as some objects of the waking alone ; but there does not exist any relationship whatsoever between the waking objects and the dream objects, which are 'apparently' like the former. Because the appearances of these two states do not exist in one and the same space series and one and the same time series, there is no chance or

Rarest Archive

probability at all of their becoming mutually substrates or supports. All the delusions that occur to us in the waking are of the type of taking one for something else or *Saadhisthhaana* type. The mere latent or subtle impression of a previous experience cannot appear or manifest as an external object through delusion. Merely by latent or subtle impressions there in the waking no external object whatsoever can be created through delusion — or why say that 'by latent or subtle impression it is not possible to do so?' — even the waking mind, howevermuch it may strain itself, cannot create even a blade of grass. That being so, what sort of an indiscretion or lack of judgment or wisdom will it be to think that the entire dream world itself is caused by the latent or subtle impressions of the waking through delusion! In any case, it has become evident that dream is not a delusion of taking one thing to be another caused from the subtle impressions of the waking, is it not? In that case, shall we say that the dream experience, like the delusion of states of delirium and such other types, though there does not exist anything whatsoever, is one which merely appears as a delusion devoid of any substrate or *Niradhisthhaana Bhraanti?* Even for that too there is no possibility. For, in states like delirium etc. there is relationship between the waking and the person having that state. But to the person who is seeing the dream there is not the least knowledge at all of the waking state apart from that dream state. Thus because of a lack of a linking category or part like the previous Intuitive experience or Paramaartha (which accrues as a result of a relationship with the memory of the previous experience) which Itself is needed for delusion to

Rarest Archive

exist, it can never be proper or reasonable to say that dream is a delusion.

116. The examination of the opinion that there is a relationship of 'falsifier - falsified' between waking and dream :

As soon as we wake up, we get the knowledge of the type — "Oh ! I had a dream ! " - and all the knowledge about the dream is falsified, is it not ? That knowledge which gets falsified is well-known in the world as 'delusion'. Just as when it appears to us in the manner — "This is not silver, but is nacro (sea-shell)" — because the knowledge of silver is falsified, it is called delusion ; similarly, because the knowledge of the dream from the waking viewpoint is a delusion. But like that the waking knowledge is not falsified at all. From this at least should the dream be called delusion or not ? Some people may question in this manner.

But even in this doubt too the defect mentioned above alone exists. For, we have already stated above that the knowledge that is falsified and the knowledge which falsifies — both have to belong to the same time series or flow. But the waking knowledge and the dream knowledge — both do not belong to the same time series ; for both, different time series are supports. Therefore, in this respect here too the characteristics which are necessary for the existence of delusion did not apply to dream knowledge. Another point : Even if the fact that — 'by the waking knowledge the dream

Rarest Archives

knowledge becomes falsified' — is true, what help is rendered by it to the determination of the present topic or problem? Because it is falsified, it cannot be argued or contended that the dream becoming a delusion itself is the benefit or utility accruing from the determination of the falsification. For, from this symptom or characteristic of falsification no help whatsoever is rendered in determining solutions for questions like — "Whether the waking which we now have assumed to be the falsifier (*Baadhaka*) is a delusion or not?" "Whether this is a dream or waking?" That is because: As we have previously (sub-section 80) itself stated, the dream during its occurrence appears as 'waking' alone. Therein (in the dream) we think or believe that the knowledge there is the falsifier and by it the knowledges of many previous dreams have been falsified. Then we do not have the knowledge at all of the type — "This is a dream"; neither do we at all look forward to realizing in the manner — "This will be falsified by the waking which occurs hereafter". Thus, because the belief that — 'Now what state exists to us, that alone is certainly the true waking knowledge' — is always established in us, in what way will the belief of the type .... 'The dream knowledge that is falsified is delusion' .... be helpful or beneficial in determining at all anything and how? Because of the existence of the regulation or rule alone of the type— "We believe all that exists in front of us to be waking and the knowledge at the moment itself to be certainly the true waking knowledge" — no one among us gets the belief or feeling in the dream that — 'Now I have come to dream from the waking'. Therefore, from this main characteristic we cannot determine or decide that 'such and such a state is waking alone'. We will

Rarest Archive

bring home here to the readers another experience which strengthens further this philosophical teaching: Often it appears to us as if in one dream another dream occurs, is it not ? In that circumstance too it appears as if 'the dream knowledge is falsified and the waking knowledge is the falsifier' ; even so, because therein the 'falsified' and the 'falsifier' both are the dream alone, on the whole for both the knowledges (or experiences) the same value exists. Not only that. Sometimes we get a series or line of dreams, one within another. In such circumstances not only do we think or feel that every dream, during its occurrence, is waking alone, but also we assume that 'all the previous dream experiences or knowledges have been falsified alone' and carry on. Then it so happens that we also determine a particular dream alone to be the genuinely steady or steadfast waking in the manner ... "This time I am really awake ; this can never be said to be a dream at all " Does the faith or belief that the dream knowledge or experience, which then at the moment of its occurrence we had believed to be waking alone, was true or genuine, is even a wee bit less than the sense of certitude that we ascribe to the present waking knowledge or experience ? No. If we are discussing with someone regarding the difference that exists between the waking experience and the dream experience, even at that moment because the waking experience is the 'falsifier knowledge', we will be arguing on the basis of the obstinate or steadfast belief that 'the sense of faith or certitude that we have in that waking experience or knowledge can never be found in, or ascribed to, the delusory knowledge of any other dream at all'. In this regard there is not even an iota of doubt. Therefore, though it is true that

Rarest Archives

the two kinds of feelings of the type – "the waking experience or knowledge" and "the dream experience or knowledge" ... accrue to us, these feelings or beliefs are produced because of the identification with the waking alone and not because there really exist two levels of experiences or knowledges of the type — "real or genuine waking experience" and 'delusory dream experience" — and to say like that too, it is established that there cannot be any other higher or plenary experience whatsoever which can prove this fact. Hence, it becomes established that although the logic based on the identification with the waking is saying that — "The experience or knowledge that is falsified is that of dream, and hence it is delusion" — that can never cause any harm whatsoever to the philosophical teaching or truth we have arrived at on the strength of comprehensive or plenary (Intuitive) experience of the type .... "Knowledge is one and one only; in It there does not exist at all any divisions or distinctions of delusion and real knowledge".

117. The phenomenon that 'in the dream the memory of the waking exists' is mere dream alone, the knowledge of the type — 'this is dream' — is also dream alone:

We have stated above (sub-section 115) that in the dream we do not have the memory that 'we have come from the waking', is it not? To this, generally there is no contradicting example to be found: for, to many people dreams within their respective durations appear to be waking alone; as soon as they are determined or discerned to be dreams, the person who

Rarest Archives

was seeing the dream becomes awake only. Although there is no rule or regulation at all that in order to wake up from dream 'the determination or recognition of dream should occur, it will not be wrong if it is said that there is a common rule or regulation that if in the dream the knowledge or experience of the type — "This is a dream" — is obtained or caused, immediately waking takes place. But in some special circumstances there is also a doubt of the type — "Now am I seeing a dream or am I awake ?'. — arising. Not only that, on certain occasions feelings of the type — "Now I am in a dream ; this is not waking ; waking exists separately" — also arise. In Delhi, one Dr. Ramnarayan was publishing a periodical called 'Practical Medicine' ; he has publicized a queer or bizarre dream that had occurred to him. Even from childhood he had an eagerness or yearning to unravel the secret of the three states. Even in that, he was thinking a great deal about the question — "Why does deep sleep occur to people daily without fail, invariably ?" He started thinking that — 'Deep sleep appears to be a wasteful killing or squandering of time ! The mind is not agreeing to believe that deep sleep is merely a phenomenon provided for the sake of relaxation or respite !' From some of the technical books which he had read he came to know that deep sleep is a state in which we merge or become one with '*Paramaatman*' or the Supreme Self (i.e. the Ultimate Reality) and he got a little mental satisfaction. Thereafter he started thinking about the analysis or examination of the dream. He tried to see whether in the dream too it is possible to reckon or cognize the experience of the type — 'Now I am seeing a dream' — and undertook this task through auto-

Rarest Archive

suggestion and self-hypnotism. One day he saw in the dream also his house, room and all the things in it, his family members — all these being of the same form, as in the waking. At that moment, his son, weeping, said: "Father, you have gone mad. Without being able to recognize us, who are your own family members only, you are saying — 'All this is a dream'" At midnight he had seen as if it was noon in that dream; although it appeared as if all the people who were there in the dream were those who were in the waking alone, none of the people of the waking, especially, had realized or reckoned anything about that 'dream'. Having discerned all this, that doctor decided in the manner — 'All this is my mind's imagination or conception alone'. Thereafter he had some more dreams in which while in the dream itself there was knowledge of the type — 'This is a dream' Then, addressing himself to the people seen in the dream, he argued in the manner — "All this is my dream alone and in this dream all of you are created by me" — and began to convince them about this fact. But no one among them agreed to this; in fact, all of them started ridiculing him only. Thereafter, he met in his waking state itself his friends and began to argue in the manner — "From the view-point of the Absolute Truth all this is dream alone." There also he did not meet with success in his argument. Then, he informed people about this deliberation regarding dream and published an appeal to thinkers and philosophers, asking them as to how can this fact — 'All this is a dream' — be presented or delineated to those who are in the dream. Collecting all the answers given to that appeal by people from different parts of the world, he then published them

Rarest Archives

in a concise form in a book called "Dream Problem" Of late, he has further carried out his deliberations on the topic of the three states, and having published a list of questions regarding the states, he has obtained answers to those questions also and published the second part of the above mentioned book — "Dream Problem — Part II".

For the present, so much of Dr. Ramnarayan's deliberations is enough. Here the subject-matter needed for our examination is : Having accepted the fact that in the dream it is not possible to remember the waking, we have established in the previous section that there is no difference between dream and waking. But from the description of the dream by Dr. Ramnarayan, which we have given, as well as on the basis of the experiences of some people among us too, does it not amount to saying that in the dream also there can be the knowledge of the type — "This is a dream"? The gist of such a long account that we have given regarding the memory of the waking arising in the dream is : When we go to the dream, if the waking world were not existing separately there could have been no scope for the experience of the type — "Now I have come to the dream; the waking exists separately" — to occur. But because such dreams are invariably — or at least very rarely — taking place, why should it not be believed that the dream world is really existing in a subtle form? Although the phenomenon of our not being able to go to the same dream daily is a common rule or regulation, in circumstances described above it is evident that again and again we can see the same kind of dream alone. For these reasons, why should it not

Rarest Archive

be determined that both 'dream' and 'waking' are really existing separately as well as independently ? Another point ; On certain occasions people who are dreaming have carried on even conversation with people in the waking. There have been cases where to questions put by those in the waking these people (who are dreaming) have given proper answers too. If the dream were not existing separately at the time of the waking itself, how could this happen ? Answering this question is very essential. For, if it is true that these two states exist independently alone, then it becomes futile to say that in the waking the whole essence of dream is merged or subsumed, as also that in the dream the whole essence of the waking is subsumed. It will be tantamount to saying that to the argument or contention that 'the dream world does not exist at all anywhere during the waking time,' there will be a vicious blow dealt.

To overcome this difficulty there is one and only one stratagem: To remember the fact that just as the waking world is confined to the waking state alone, the dream world is confined to the dream state alone (sub - section 27) — this itself is that stratagem. There is no meaning whatsoever to the statement — 'Waking and dream being two different species of states, both these states can exist in the same time series'— for, apart from the waking time and the dream time there is no support or evidence of an experience whatsoever to know or cognize that there exists yet another time series different from both these (sub-section 77). It being so, there is no meaning for the statement — "Waking and dream - both these are co-extensive now

Rarest Archive

only". Similarly, for the statement — "The memory of the waking occurs in the dream" — there is no meaning at all. For, without assuming that there is a common denominator of a time series as a substrate for waking and dream this phenomenon of 'memory' does not accrue. But such a common time series is not in the experience of any one at all. In the same manner, even if all of us have believed that the memory of the dream occurs in the waking, that too is a delusion alone; as the deliberation of that topic has to be made in the following section, let us give up that topic here. Now the question that — 'The memory of the waking exists in the dream, in the dream itself it is known that 'this is a dream' — in this manner there is a dream experience indeed ! What happens to this experience ?" — will arise, is it not ? To this the answer is : Just as any knowledge of the waking belongs to the waking state alone, in the same manner all the knowledge that accrues within the dream too belongs to the dream state alone. It is true that there can arise a doubt regarding the dream of the type — 'Why should not this be a dream ?' — but with regard to the waking also there can arise a doubt of the type — 'Why should not this be a dream alone ?' Some people who doubt like this invariably exist in the world too. Thus because this doubt is common to both the states, it does not amount to saying from this that there is any valid division whatsoever of the type — This is dream and 'This is waking'. For the present, the knowledge, memory, feelings of elation and misery etc., conceptions and misconception, — all these which occur in the dream should be ascribed to the dream alone, and from there (i.e. the dream state) for all these to cross or migrate over to

Rarest Archives

the waking, there is no support of any universal experience whatsoever. Therefore, the above memory of the waking which occurred in Dr. Ramnarayan's dream is also dream alone; to him there occurred a dream of the knowledge of the type — "I have a memory of the waking" — and he had a dream with the feeling of the type — "This is a dream". For, there is no support or evidence at all to say that the 'waking mind' existed in the dream. This alone is the philosophical truth in accordance with universal experience.

118. The memory that occurs in the waking with regard to the dream too is not really its memory:

Now in this deliberation another off-shoot arises. To Dr. Ramnarayan the phenomenon of the knowledge accruing within the dream of the type — "This is a dream" — was his experience; he himself has said that that knowledge was the fruit or result of the *Saadhana* or spiritual disciplines he observed in his waking. Although it is to be stated that his statement cannot be believed or trusted in the matter of the determination of the Ultimate Reality, if needed we ourselves can check up and see by performing the *Saadhanas* or spiritual disciplines alone which he has mentioned. Not only has he seen the above-mentioned dream but also several other dreams of this kind. He has mentioned in his book that after reading a book written by one Devamaata — "*Sushupti and Samaadhi*" — as a result of some special practices, the occurrence of dreams pertaining to secular or mundane matters stopped and instead *Saadhus*

Rarest Archives

and holy men appeared in his dreams and that he carried on conversations with them. He has written this by remembering alone what experience he had in the dream after becoming awake only. We have read in the books written by ancient sages that there exist many people who have this kind of mystic powers of the dream. It being so, how can we discard experience as well as elders' statement and decide that 'there does not exist any relationship whatsoever between waking and dream'? On the other hand, if our belief in all these is proper only, it appears to our mind that there must be perforce some kind of a difference between waking and dream! How can we overcome this difficult strait?

For all this series of difficulties, mainly the waking viewpoint alone is the cause and this fact is clearly understood or realized if it is deliberated upon a little more deeply. For instance, the division into the two knowledges or experiences of the types — 'waking' and 'dream' — is not reckoned at all by anyone, whosoever it may be, without his having the identification with the waking ego. What is the root cause for all the conceptions of the type — "I had a dream; in that dream I had such and such experiences. In many dreams the memory of the waking does not exist. But by special disciplines or practices we can acquire the power or capacity of making both these, i.e. the memory of the waking and the knowledge or experience of the type — 'This is a dream' — appear simultaneously as dreams. Not only this. We can even acquire the power of getting excellent dreams; we can get spiritual instructions after getting awake"-? Apart from the identification with the waking ego, is there

Rarest Archives

any other root cause at all? 'Identification with the waking ego' does not mean the deliberate acquisition or enhancement of the wrong conception or notion only obtained by the partiality or bias of the type — "Let waking alone be there' ("we prefer waking alone") ; but it means seeing or considering everything from the viewpoint of the waking experience alone (or giving predominance only to the waking viewpoint). What appears to that viewpoint is itself taken as the basis or the main premise for all our deliberation — This alone is being called 'the identification with the waking ego' by us. Because waking alone is the basis for all kinds of our empirical transactions, there is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that the observation through the waking viewpoint as well as the logic or reasoning adopted by that viewpoint is beneficial to our empirical transactions indeed. But now the question is — "Can that observation and that reasoning help us reach or grasp the Ultimate Reality?" We have been repeatedly saying that to either the waking viewpoint or its logic tha ability or capacity of leading us to the Ultimate Reality is not there at all and further we have also reiterated that those people who have acquired control over the Intuitive experience through the examination of the three states of Consciousness and the consequent pervasive or comprehensive reasoning based on, and in full agreement with, such Intuitive experience can realize or cognize the Ultimate or Absolute Reality (sub-sections 30, 33). For the present, the fact that — 'the statement about the memory of the waking existing in the dream is based on the memory of the dream that we get in our waking alone and not on anything else'— is evident. Therefore, this can never become the path to attain the Ultimate Reality.

Rarest Archive

In this discussion we must keep in mind what subject-matter we have started to propound or establish. If we do not do so, there is a possibility of wasting time in irrelevant considerations alone. We have not undertaken to establish that either the fact that — "In the dream there does not occur a feeling of the type— 'This is a dream" — or the fact that "That kind of distinct or definite knowledge cannot accrue". For the feeling of the type — "This is a dream" — to occur in the dream, the waking viewpoint alone is the cause ; for, then we assume that there is a state like waking which is more real than the state which is the substrate for the feeling of the dream and have begun 'to measure' the dream. Instead of this, in order to decide or determine that the state which we naturally call 'waking' is also a dream alone — i.e. between the state which appears to us as a dream and the state which we now think or believe to be waking there is no difference whatsoever, making the dream as the yardstick alone — is the counter move to the viewpoint of the identification with the waking ego. Then saying — 'Waking or dream is one and the same' — or saying— 'There is no difference between waking and dream' ... both these mean one and the same. Although it is true tha twe get the 'feeling of waking' as well as 'the feeling of dream', the fact that — 'Really the state called waking cannot attain any greater or more important status than that of the dream' -- is established by taking that viewpoint. This second aspect alone is what we have undertaken to propound or establish here.

119. The uncertain or indeterminate nature inherent in the waking memory :

Because all that is known to people about the

Rarest Archive

dream is generally based on the memory that arises in the waking alone, all those who wish to show the inferiority of the dream and the superiority of the waking are putting forward the support, or authority, alone of the memory of the dream that they obtain in the waking. Therefore, it is essential to determine as to how much trustworthy is the report or information of this waking memory. But even before that, first and foremost, let us examine or analyse a little in general this knowledge itself called 'memory'. The knowledge that we get in the waking is appearing in two forms, viz. experience (*Anubhava*) and memory (*Smriti*). Between these two, memory is a phenomenon which is born or caused by mere subtle or latent impressions (*Samskaaras*); all the knowledge devoid of memory is called experience (*Anubhava*). *Smriti* or memory has to accrue by the latent impressions alone of the experiences gained in the past. *Samskaara* or latent impression having been lying dormant in the mind raises its head as soon as any cause which stimulates it is obtained. "In the past I had experienced it like this" — this type of notion alone is the complete form of *Smriti* or memory; generally, the memory of the object alone having been produced, it may not even be remembered. at all as to how and when that object was experienced. Anyway, because there is a regulation that the object that is memorized does not exist in front of us, the doubt of the type — 'Whether that is the right memory or not?' — will always remain with us invariably. For that reason only, people have divided memory into two grougs, viz. *'Yathaartha'* or true to the object and *'Ayathaartha'* or not true to the object If the previous experience is true to the object or situa-

Rarest Archive

tion, they call the memory born out of that as 'true', otherwise they call it untrue or false. But it is difficult to decide whether such and such is true memory or not. For, to some people the nature of forgetting may be more; then they will have to provide the writings or the old times or evidences of other persons. Even then, we have assumed memory alone as the support to prove that memory is true. Let it be. It is better to place in mind another special characteristic regarding 'memory'. That is: Let it be any memory; it can not bring and place in front of us once more either the object which we had experienced in the past or any past event. It is true that to all of us a definite form of experience of the type — "That alone is this" — keep on occurring. This is called '*Pràtyabhijnaana*' or recognitory knowledge. There is not an iota of doubt about the fact that for our empirical or day-to-day transactions this *Pratyabhijnaana* or recognitory knowledge is very helpful. But to believe that whatever this recognitory knowledge tells us is all absolutely true, there is a big difficulty. That is: The part going by the name — 'that' — in this knowledge, i.e. the form of the object or the event which had been experienced in the past situation or circumstance, we have to believe on the basis of the statement or indication alone of the memory. Whatever we may do, that particular experience of the past period of time cannot come and stand before us once again. It being so, how can it be said that the knowledge of the type — "That alone is this" — is indubitable? Because this kind of a defect exists in memory alone, scientists — though they accept it as complementary or helpful to empirical dealings — do not include memory in the group of definite evidences or means of

Rarest Archive

determination. Let it be. Even in the case of the experiences like perception, inference etc. which are included in the group of determinative means or testimonies — do they exist without any taint or relationship with memory? If we observe from this standpoint or aspect, that also cannot be confidently said or affirmed. For, the knowledge that accrues through the senses is called *'Pratyaksha'* or perception. If a person, who has the syllogistic knowledge of the type — "Wherever there is smoke, there fire exists" — sees smoke at a far-off place and by that main characteristic imagines fire to exist at that place and decides in that manner, then the resultant knowledge that accrues is called *'Anumiti'* or inferential knowledge. Those people whom we love and adore —, that knowledge which we get as a result of their statement is called *'Shaabda Jnaana'* or traditional hearsay knowledge which we believe *in toto*. It is possible to include all the experiences in these three kinds of knowledges alone. Here for the perceptual knowledge to accrue the latent impression of the previous experience is itself essential.; with the aid of that latent impression alone we are deciding or determining the things that are before us as stone, tree etc. Therefore, even for the perceptual knowledge also to accrue it signifies that there is a relationship with memory. *Anumiti* or inferential, syllogistic knowledge which imagines the existence of fire through the perception of the smoke (i.e. conjectures using both inductive and deductive logic), the *Shaabda Jnaana* or traditional hearsay knowledge or belief in elders' statements, which is got by deciding the meaning of the statement heard through perception — for both these because the aid or support of

Rarest Archives

perception is invariably required, it amounts to saying that for both of them also the support of memory is necessary. In any case, our entire gamut of empirical or day-to-day dealings stands on memory alone; that memory thrives on the support of previous or past experience alone.

Anyway, from the deliberation carried out so far it is established that because every knowledge that accrues in the waking stands lop-sided on a rough, circular base, as it were, it is not enough or adequate to decide or determine the Ultimate Reality. Although it is true that people have in their day-to-day dealings divided memory as true memory and false memory, we do not see any kind of difference whatsoever in the forms or natures of these two kinds of memory. The means itself needed to decide in the manner — "Whether a particular memory is true or false?" — is not in our control. Wherever we have understood that we are capable of deciding or determining by means of examination— in all such places or situations some aspect of memory is mixed up invariably; in deciding the question — "Whether that aspect of memory is true or false?" — too, because this same difficulty exists, we do not get any sense of finality anywhere at all. To say that — "From many authoritative sources as well as the agreement or approval of many people we accept a certain thing to be true memory" — is enough indeed for our day-to-day transactions; but even those authoritative sources and approvals too are being invariably shadowed by the ghost of that memory aspect and so there is no hope of finding out the true memory anywhere at all. When the plight of memory of the object in the waking

Rarest Archives

itself is like this, what is there to say about the consideration of the memory of the dream object?

120. The phenomenon of the memory of dream that accrues in the waking is not the real memory:

So far, assuming that the memory of the dream is the real memory only, we have been progressively finding the defects existing in the generality of memories. But if observed incisively, it becomes certain that this memory that accrues regarding the dream is not of a kind which belongs to the species or varieties of the memories which occur in the waking at all. For instance: To one and the same person the experiences and memories should occur; they should have taken place at different points or places in the same series of the time flow or flux; between the two the memory must have occurred because in the past time the experience must have accrued and now at the present moment its latent impression must have arisen. All these are the regulations which become evident from the natural characteristics of memory. When a person states: "When I was a young man, I used to get such and such an experience; but now because I have become an old man such an experience is not possible." — though all other things have changed, his one and the same ego of the form of 'I' and Pure Consciousness, which is the substratum for it (i. e. the ego), remain unchanged. But with regard to the waking and the dream what is that entity which is common to both those states and which remains unchanged? Among the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect, the memory, the ego — not a single entity remains common

Rarest Archive

to both these states ; there does not remain the time and the space which are common to both these states. Therefore, it is not possible to say that between these two states one occurred first and then the other followed or occurred. It being so, what support is there to assume that in the waking the memory of the dream takes place ? It is not our opinion at all to say that we do not get the experience or knowledge of the nature or form — "I saw a dream". That knowledge keeps on occurring to every one. Therefore, no one can say that it does not exist or happen. But can it be called 'a memory' of the dream ? On the support or authority of that 'memory' can it be decided that dream is a delusion ? — This is the crux of the problem now. We have so far indicated the objections that exist in calling this phenomenon 'a memory'. From this it becomes certain that on the strength of this 'memory' to believe that—'In accordance with that 'memory' the past experience occurred' —is also wrong. Let alone the phenomenon that on certain rare occasions in the waking the memory of the type — "In the dream I had a knowledge in the manner — "This is a dream" -- is likely to occur ; generally to all of us as soon as we wake up, we get the knowledge of the type — "So far I saw a dream" — is it not ? If this were really a memory, in accordance with this memory at that moment why did not the experience of the form — "This is a dream" — occur ? To this question what answer can there be ? When there is no answer whatsoever forthcoming, will it be proper or justifiable to decide, on the basis or strength of the special or queer experience that may occur rarely or on certain occasions alone in some particular dream, in the manner — "This is really a

Rarest Archive

memory" ? If Dr. Ramnarayan had a particular type of memory as a result of certain special practices or disciplines that he had observed, then it is proper to think that either that 'memory' was the fruit or result of his spiritual practices or disciplines or because the practices and their results belonged to one and the same state having the relationship with one and the same time-space series, they have the relationship of cause and effect. Discarding that, what justification is there to tie up or build up a relationship on the strength of this queer or bizarre experience between waking and dream which have no relationship whatsoever ? In addition to this, to say that — "The relationship of the waking with the dream does not exist" we find enough support in Dr. Ramnarayan's experience of the dream itself. For instance, he dreamt as if he saw his own house itself which existed in the waking and as if he had seen his wife and children, belongings — all of which had existed in that house. But it had been his experience that neither that house nor the wife and children — none of them was of the waking. It being so, what authority or support is there to imagine or think that the waking mind alone had somehow wriggled out of the waking and had entered the dream and from that he had this memory ? Apart from this, whatever has been stated so far — all that is Dr. Ramnarayan's experience ; is it not very essential that all of us should compare it with the experience of each one of us and see ? We are not saying at all that either others' experience or the elders' or well-wishers' statement should be neglected or ignored ; let us perforce give to those experiences as well as statements what value they deserve. But what we are saying here is only that the comprehensive

Rarest Archive

or plenary Intuitive experience as well as the pervasive logical devices in keeping with Intuitive experience should not be rejected or repudiated by such special or queer experiences or well-wishers' statements. The experiences also of those who say that — 'As a result of the dream experiences, I got in the waking elation and fear as well as good and bad fruits, and further I saw really the objects and the human beings whom I had seen in the dream' — we should evaluate in the manner which we have mentioned here alone. They have imagined this mutual relationship between waking and dream on the basis of the waking viewpoint alone and not based on the comprehensive or plenary viewpoint at all. Just as to the tiger seen in the dream the waking sword is not useful at all for dealing a blow, similarly the dream tiger cannot be the cause for the shivering of the person who is awake; the memory alone which occurs in the waking of the type — "I saw a particular tiger in my dream and being afraid I woke up" — is the cause for this shivering. Are there not many people who doubt or anticipate a non-existent fear or apprehension in the manner — "In the future if it happens like this, what will be my fate or plight?" — and from that apprehension alone keep worrying? In that circumstance, do we doubt that either their worry is an effect or the event — which is to take place in the future or though it can never at all take place, it is anticipated because of their imagination or apprehension alone — is the cause for that worry? No. Their present imagination alone is the cause for their worry, indeed. In the same manner, we should understand while considering the fruits of the dream memory.

Rarest Archive

121. The Saakshi or Witness, i. e. the Self, alone is the cause for the memory of one in the other between the waking and the dream :

To say that either the relationship of the dream to the waking or the relationship of the waking to the dream does not exist at all, enough proof or evidence is there in Dr. Ramnarayan's dream experience also. That is : The house, wife and children etc. which he had seen in his dream appeared to him to be the same house, wife and children etc. which he possessed or which belonged to him in the waking ; but it was certain that neither that house nor those wife and children were really of the waking. If they had made any mark in the dream house, that mark would not have been seen or noticed in the waking house at all ; similarlv, it had become certain to him in the waking that his dream son, wife and other children were not really of the waking. Even so, he conceived or thought that he had himself come from the waking and that he was seeing the house, wife and children etc. imagined by him in the dream. Here in which mind did the memory that he had come from the waking as well as the knowledge of the type — "This is a dream" — occur ? Dr. Ramnarayan has not stated whether his body, life force or *Praana*, mind, intellect, ego — all these appeared in his dream as those very things of the waking alone or whether they appeared as different ones; in this regard, he did not seem to discuss; let us, for argument's sake, assume that he had discussed and that he had got the certainty in his dream that his body etc. were of the waking alone. Then at least would it have amounted to saying that that dream was

Rarest Archiver

different from the waking? Examine this. Then, it would have become clear to him that dream was a mere delusion alone which had appeared just like the waking; for, although the dream house appeared just like the waking house alone, just as between those two houses there did not exist any relationship whatsoever at all, similarly even if the body etc. in these two states had appeared as one and the same only, it would not have been possible to reckon that 'all of them were one and the same. Before he practised the special disciplines he did not have the knowledge of the type — "This is a dream". Then, like all others only he was thinking in the manner — "This is waking alone"; at that moment especially, he did not have in his dream the memory of the waking at all. He must have got innumerable dreams in which the body etc. were all completely different in each of the two states. Now see. Dr. Ramnarayan, who before he practised the special disciplines had seen the waking and the dream, Dr. Ramnarayan, who after practising the special disciplines had experienced the memory of the waking in the dream — 'both these persons were one and the same' — only after this kind of 'memory' occurred to him in the waking, he wrote the book, "Dream Problem" is it not? Let us now deliberate upon the question as to which 'entity' was it that existed as common to both these states. In all these states none of these, viz. the body or the life force (*Praana*) or the mind or the intellect or the ego, was common. Even if it is assumed for once that the body, the life force etc. of the previous waking were themselves of the 'present waking' alone, the body, the life force etc. especially which had appeared in the dreams — none of them existed like the rest at

Rarest Archive

all. Even so, he got the knowledge which could gather all these together and see or objectify; he got the 'memory' also that all these occurred to him alone. Can the experience that he got in such circumstances be called 'memory'? He did not have any body (physique) whatsoever or any mind whatsoever common to all the states; even so, he got the 'feeling or belief' of the type — "One who experienced all these was myself". The knowledge of the type — 'I' — or the 'I' notion is one which has to occur perforce in the inner instrument of the mind (*Antahkarana*); but no inner instrument or the mind whatsoever was common to all his states. The 'I' of the waking had not seen the dream, the 'I' of the dream had not woken up (i.e. was not in the waking). Even it being so, to Dr. Ramnarayan as well as to all of us the experience of the nature or form of memory like — "I saw a dream" — has occurred! How should this phenomenon be explained? It is clear or evident from this that unless an 'entity' which is common to both waking and dream is agreed upon or accepted, it will not be possible at all to imagine any substrate or refuge to the experience of the type — 'The memory of the dream'. There is no need whatsoever to seek strenuously and find such an 'entity'; the Saakshi Chaitanya or the Witnessing Pure Consciousness which eternally observes the whole gamut of visions or perceptions which appear internally as well as externally in the waking and the dream 'exists invariably and unfailingly'. It is not possible to imagine that this *Saakshi* or Witnessing Principle is one for the dream and another for the waking; if any one starts to imagine in that manner, it will immediately flash clearly that the support of the knowledge of

Rarest Archives

another witnessing principle which knows those two will become necessary. We have been showing, here and there, all through that this *Saakshi Chaitanya* or Witnessing Pure Consciousness alone is the very essence of the knowledge as well as the existence of ourselves and the world that appears to us. On the strength of this *Saakshi* or Witnessing Principle alone, which is the substrate for everything, it has been possible to have the Intuitive experience of the type — "I saw a dream". Because they are not able to separate or distinguish and Intuitively know this Witnessing Principle apart from the phenomenon of 'I' (or the 'I' notion), the common people are becoming deluded to think that the waking 'I' is itself the 'I' which knows the dream.

If the Witnessing Pure Consciousness alone is the 'I' which saw the dream, then what is the cause for our reckoning the dream to have taken place in the past time in the manner — "I saw the dream"? Is not the Witness or the Self a witness indeed to time also? That is not belonging either to the past time or the future time at all, is it not? — This kind of a doubt may trouble anybody. To that the consolation or a tentatively satisfactory solution is this much: As indicated above, in the statement — "I saw a dream" — though the fact that the Witness alone is the Pure Consciousness or Knowledge which illumines the dream and is the Absolute Reality, in the empirical, day-to-day dealings people do not have this knowledge. They are carrying on their day-to-day transactions in the manner — "I saw a dream" — by mixing up invariably the waking 'I'

Rarest Archives

and the Absolute Witnessing Principle (i. e. Pure Consciousness). Because the waking 'I' or ego is tied up with time, it is but natural for it that whatsoever does not belong to the present period all that appears either as the memory of the past experience or as the anticipation of the future experience. Because we have not separated the Witnessing Pure Consciousness and the waking ego or 'I' notion alone, the past wakings, dreams and deep sleeps — all these are appearing to us in the forms of 'memory'. In Vedanta, to the natural misconception of having mixed up mutually the Witnessing Pure Consciousness and the waking 'I' as well as mutually superimposing the innate characteristic features of one on the other in this manner is given the name — *'Adhyaasa'* or *'Avidya'*. As the explanation or description of *Adhyaasa* is being given in due course (sub-section 132), for the present we will stop its consideration here. For the steadfast belief of the type — "In the past on innumerable occasions I have slept and woken up" — the cause is our having innate identification with the entity of the waking 'I' and having misconceived the waking 'I' and the Witness (Pure Consciousness), one for the other, alone. If this is kept in mind, it will become possible to solve easily another doubt. Even though we reckon the waking, the dream and the deep sleep — all these as belonging to the past time only, we believe that the waking alone to be real and we discard or reject the dream to be false or unreal and generally do not take the deep sleep into the reckoning at all. What is the cause for this partial attitude? For this too the reason is our having given the greater value or importance alone to the 'I' that

Rarest Archiver

appears in the waking. As all the feelings or concepts which are implicit in the entity called 'I' is being examined in detail in the forthcoming section (sub-section 142), that topic we will give up for the time being. For the present, it must be remembered that either in the waking or in the dream we are invariably attached or tied up with an 'I'. This 'I' is always giving predominance to or is preferentially disposed towards, as it were, its own respective state of identification alone and projects it in the manner — "This alone is waking ; the whole universe of this waking is real ; many such real waking states have occurred and gone by in the past and in the future many waking states will occur" ; further, it is degrading the states as well as experiences other than that state in which it has innate identification or attachment to lower or inferior levels. This phenomenon of 'I' alone is the cause for the differentiating attitude entertained between waking and dream, mentioned above. But in deep sleep its sway (influence or jurisdiction) does not exist ; there no world whatsoever is seen ; for that reason, we are not giving or attaching any value or importance to deep sleep in our waking. If observed properly, i.e. from the absolute viewpoint of the Pure Consciousness, the Witness alone is joining all the three states, or in other words, It alone acts as the 'common denominator or substrate', as it were, to all the three states : the phenomenon of 'I' is different indeed for waking and dream. Even so, we mix up both these and are carrying on our day-to-day transactions in the manner — "I slept. I dreamt, I woke up". It need not be gainsaid that the Witnessing Pure Consciousness (*Saakshi Chaitanya*) alone, which is the essence of

Rarest Archive

the phenomenon of 'I', is the substrate for our empirical, day-to-day transactions.

122. The benefit that accrues from viewing the states, one from the standpoint of another :

In the phrase — "The waking viewpoint" — the opinion of taking these three, viz. the waking 'I', its knowledge and the object appearing to it (i. e. the objective world), alone as the main constituents of the view is implicit. Although this view is enough for the waking transactions, the fact that it is a hindrance to the determination of the Ultimate Reality we have mentioned several times. There is a strong method of treatment to avoid this view. This treatment is to put or pose the question to ourselves only of the type — "At the time of the deliberation or consideration of any topic or subject - matter, immediately after observing the states from the waking viewpoint what change will take place in our opinion by observing these very states from the viewpoint of another state?" In the present context, we must ask overselves — "After observing the waking and the dream from the waking viewpoint if the same states are observed from the dream viewpoint, how will they appear ?" Such a queer logic or reasoning will be very beneficial or useful to us. For, if the waking is observed from the waking viewpoint alone, it does not amount to our having observed it completely or comprehensively. In the waking the division of subject and object is unavoidable and insurmountable ; there the subject cannot exist devoid of the object, nor can the object

Rarest Archive

exist devoid of the subject. Therefore, it is impossible therein to consider the totality of the subject and the object, i. e. taking both together and considering them objectively, comprehensively. Because therein the one who knows by gathering together both the subject and the object is also the subject alone, he will have to become an object to himself. This is impossible. Therefore, those who wish to know the waking subject-object complex as one complete or whole entity or phenomenon will have to ratiocinate or contemplate as to— 'How this state will appear to the dream viewpoint?' In the dream which is the object of examination of the type — "I saw a dream" — both the subject and the object in it have come into our reckoning as objects. Similarly, if it is cognized as to — 'How will the waking appear to us if examined from the dream viewpoint?' — it will amount to our objectifying this waking state comprehensively in its totality, If it is deliberated upon from this viewpoint, the philosophical truth that — 'Because both the states are the appearances alone of the Ultimate Reality, the essential truth or Being of waking as well as the essential truth or Being of dream is one and the same Ultimate Reality, i. e. Pure Consciousness' — will emerge out on the surface, i. e. this truth evolves itself. The defect of the partial viewpoint of dividing the Ultimate Reality and examining each part only will not exist in this comprehensive or plenary viewpoint (sub-section 18). The fact that the controversial discussions, which cannot be solved convincingly and conclusively, of the type — 'Is the 'knowledge' real or is the 'known' real?'' — are futile will immediately flash before our intellect.

Rarest Archiver

Here a doubt may arise: In the waking we can somehow carry on the consideration regarding the dream, for the dream is an object to the waking memory; but how can we know as to how in the dream the waking will appear? Then (i. e. in the dream) we do not have the memory of the waking at all! Even for argument's sake if it is said — "Just as the dream is considered from the waking viewpoint, it is also possible to consider the waking from the dream viewpoint" — to the knowledge or consciousness of the present state, in which the deliberation is being carried out, the totality of the subject-object complex alone becomes the object, does it not? Thus, because it amounts to our considering the object alone, how does it amount to our knowing the secret of the subject? Even if it is assumed that this also is somehow possible, our deliberation will be carried out in the waking alone, is it not? Then, it amounts to our giving greater importance or predominance to the waking alone, is it not?

This doubt is caused because of not understanding properly the true purpose or the hidden truth of the viewpoint of the three states. For instance, the person who raises the objection of the type — "In the waking there is the memory of the dream; but in the dream there is no memory at all of the waking. It being so, how can one examine one by the viewpoint of the other?" — is not himself knowing his own experience. For, although from the waking viewpoint the dream appears to be a state of an inferior category, because when seen from the dream viewpoint the dream appears to be

Rarest Archive

waking alone, it is but natural not to remember any other state to be waking at that moment which is superior to it. Thus when observing from the dream viewpoint as it amounts to the non-existence of waking itself, or because both waking and dream have become waking alone, it becomes certain that both waking and dream have the same value. Apart from this, we have not undertaken the task now of showing either the existence or the non-existence of the memory of the dream in the waking or of the memory of the waking in the dream; the knowledge which validly may appear in one state in the form of memory of the other is not really memory, it is a mere Vikalpa or misconception — thus we have already (sub-section 120) expounded in detail. The knowledge or consciousness to which the object or subject-matter that is acceptable does not exist that knowledge is called *Vikalpa* in the Sanskrit language. For instance, the knowledge that accrues to us on hearing the phrase like — 'The hare's horn' — is mere *Vikalpa* or misconception; for, the hare does not have horns at all. Therefore, there is no threat or danger whatsoever posed to the method which determines the truth of a state from either the phenomenon of the non-existence or of existence of the memory of waking in a dream That Entity on the strength of which we experience and then say that — "In the dream there does not exist any memory of the waking or in the waking there is no memory of the dream existing" that Entity alone is the *Saakshi Chaitanya* or the Witnessing Pure Consciousness, that alone is the Knowledge or Consciousness which is common to both the states, viz. waking and dream. This truth becomes clear or evident by the experience of the memory also.

Rarest Archive

Therefore, there does not exist any defect or blemish whatsoever in saying that — "The states must be observed one by the viewpoint of another". If we start the consideration of the Ultimate Reality by this method, the fact that the defect, that all of us suffer from naturally, of observing from the viewpoint of one state alone, i.e. viewing everything predominantly from the waking standpoint alone, is overcome. This fact also remains unhampered or untarnished.

Further, let us now examine the doubt — "If everything becomes object only, how does it amount to having known the secret of the subject at all?" It is true that, whether it is in the dream or whether it is in the waking, it is not possible for us to deliberate upon anything whatsoever without objectification; even so, if we undertake to objectify the dream from the waking viewpoint and the waking from the dream viewpoint, we will have to perforce thrust out, as it were, both the subject (i. e. the ego) and the object (i. e, objective world) of the respective state and remain, or take a stand, in their Witness (i. e. *Atman* or Pure Consciousness) alone. The subject and the object of the dream, the Witness of the totality of both these — if all this is gathered together and juxtaposed with the waking subject and object and the Witness of the totality of these two — the combination of all these— then the fact that—'These triads are equal from the absolute point of view, — will 'flash in our mind like a bolt from the blue. **If the Saakshi or Witnessing Pure Consciousness which exists in the same form in both the states, is taken as the substratum and then if the remaining parts of waking and of dream are compared, each with the other, not only**

Rarest Archiver

the fact that there does not exist any difference whatsoever between them but also the fact that 'between them when one exists the other one does not exist anywhere at all' is established; yet another subtle or profound truth that 'the Saakshi Chaitanya or Witnessing Pure Consciousness alone, without having undergone any change whatsoever, is assuming both these two forms, is imbibed by the mind. It will amount to having understood or known the whole secret itself of the subject and the object which appear in the states by an effortless analysis. Therefore, the doubt that it will amount to considering the object alone is not proper.

Further, the objection, viz. 'All this consideration was carried out in the waking alone, is it not?' -- alone has remained to be answered, is it not? To find a satisfactory solution to this there is no need to strain oneself at all. For, there is no restriction whatsoever that consideration or deliberation should not be carried out in the waking. Because all the doubts that have occurred to us have arisen in the waking alone, it is but natural that the consideration of finding the devices of solving them also is to be carried out in the waking alone. But carrying out such deliberation on the basis of or following the waking viewpoint alone is wrong. What defect lurks in this viewpoint is already (sub-section 37) mentioned by us in this treatise. By following or adopting the different viewpoints which we have indicated in this section this defect is overcome. If the waking is observed from the viewpoints of the dream and of the deep sleep, the dream from the viewpoints of the waking and the deep sleep and the deep sleep from

Rarest Archives

the viewpoints of the waking and the dream — if this process is continued for some period, then the defect of the lop-sided viewpoint of the nature — "The waking alone is the real state" — will be overcome.

123. The benefit or fruit that accrues from the comparison between the waking and the dream:

For this reason, let us continue further this present comparison between the waking and the dream. First of all, let us avoid the habit or addiction of observing the knowledge or experience of the dream through the waking viewpoint and evaluating it, but observe the dream from the dream viewpoint itself and then from that same viewpoint if the waking is observed what will be our opinion — let us see: (1) First, we cognize the comparison to the effect that the means or evidence-oriented viewpoint (*Pramaana Drishti*) that exists in the waking itself appears to exist for the time being (i. e. during the dream experience) in the dream also. (2) Just as we think here in the waking that if there is any defect in the senses or instruments of knowledge or if the essential, innate nature of on object has changed only, the knowledge that accrues will be a misconception or that it will be delusory alone and that all the remaining knowledges are proper or correct, we think in the same way therein in the dream also. (3) In the dream also the divisions of the type — *Pramaatru* (the cognizer), *Pramaana* (cognition), *Prameya* (the cognized object), *Pramiti* (the right cognition as the resultant), which are here

Rarest Archives

in the waking also exist there in the dream. (4) The phenomenon that by the means of *Pratyaksha* or sensory perception, *Anumaana* or inference, *Shabda* or the statement or words of trustworthy elders we obtain knowledge of objects or various topics — which we experience in the waking — all these are common to the dream also. (5) The phenomenon of the existence of the differen. forms of knowledge of the type — *Jnaana* (perception), *Dhyaana* (contemplation), *Samshaya* (doubt), *Nischaya* (determination), *Sambhaayana* (supposition or fancying), *Bhraanti* (delusion) — which we experience in the waking are to be found there in the dream also. (6) The memory of the past events or of objects seen in the past, the experience of the present event or perception of the object existing in our presence now, the anticipation of the future event or object — these types of divisions in the knowledges or experiences also exist there in the dream. (7) The phenomenon of each knowledge appearing as true for the time being, and later on when another knowledge falsifies or invalidates it, the former knowledge being understood as delusory or false — all this too happens there in the dream. (8) The distinctive knowledges of waking and dream as well as the certainty about what is currently before us alone to be the 'real' waking — these also exist there in the dream. (9) The memory of the fact that dreams are many, the certainty that all of them are delusions and the steadfast, deep-rooted belief that the waking which is before us or currently being experienced exists without being falsified — all these also exist there in the dream. In any case, the replica alone of the nature of the waking knowledge appears in the dream too ; we do not at all feel or reckon therein 'that

Rarest Archive

nature or form of experience (of the dream) to be similar to another'. When observed from this viewpoint, in the matter of the experience or knowledge there does not at all exist any difference whatsoever between the waking and the dream. If we go to dream or come to waking from deep sleep, it is not possible to know distinctly by means of any special features or characteristics whatsoever the dream in the manner — "I am seeing a dream only and am not awake"; or it is not possible to observe in the waking any one special feature or characteristic whatsoever which is superior to that of the dream. For, the knowledge of the dream appears to be 'that of the waking alone' in all respects and aspects. If observed in this manner, it can be said that any knowledge other than that of the waking does not exist in our experience at all. Because these two states are flashing before, so to say, or being illumined and objectifed by, Pure Consciousness of the Witness or Self alone, in that matter or aspect too there does not exist any difference whatsoever between these two states. Although the Witness can, by discarding one, see the other, there is no possibility whatsoever of both these states existing at one and the same time or simultaneously in front of the Witness or Self. Why talk more? If we endeavour or attempt to place both these states one by the side of the other in front of the Witness, we will remain in the absolute, essential nature or form of the Witness alone without having any knowledge or consciousness whatsoever of the states or, in other words, in the innate nature of Being of the Absolute, Transcendental, Pure Consciousness, which is not a Witnes at all in the ultimate analysis Therefore, between the dream and the waking there is

Rarest Archives

neither the superiority of one nor the inferiority of one; both are phenomena having an existence of the same kind, both are not different from the Witness which knows them; in truth, these are Witnessing Pure Consciousness alone — This alone becomes the final or ultimate philosophical truth or teaching.

(G) The Essential Nature Of Pure Knowledge Or Consciousness

124. Deep sleep is not a state devoid of Consciousness :

Let us gather together at one place here what facts have been established by the deliberation upon the Pure Consciousness which we have carried out so far in various ways. Deep sleep experience alone is the main means or proof for us for this task. When observed from the point of view of knowledge, people keep on getting some wrong conceptions or notions regarding deep sleep. Generally people have understood that deep sleep means a state in which there does not exist any knowledge whatsoever ; but for the particular features of the type — the existence of knowledge, its non-existence — there is no scope for them in deep sleep. For, knowledge accruing and its passing away — these phenomena are applicable or relevant to the waking and the dream, where such perceptual

Rarest Archive

knowledges of the mind and their respective objects exist. In those states it is possible for the knowledge of the pot to accrue first, followed by the knowledge of the cloth, followed by the knowledge of the tree. There in the waking and in the dream whatever knowledges accrue — all of them are perceptual or cognitive knowledges (*Pratyayas*) alone. They are also called *Vritti Jnaana* or conceptual knowledge. But any *Vritti Jnaana* or conceptual knowledge whatsoever cannot be Pure Consciousness; for, in order to get the *Vritti Jnaana* there is a regulation that the objects perforce must exist. It is true that in deep sleep we do not have the perceptual knowledge; but there the inner instrument of the mind, which is the substrate needed for the existence of the concepts (*Vrittis*), is also non existent, nor do the objects needed for the perceptual knowledge too exist. Therefore, it is true that deep sleep is a state devoid of knowledge in the sense that therein no conceptual knowledge whatsoever exists; but because there in deep sleep there is never any possibility of such conceptual knowledge existing or accruing in any period of time at all, it will not be proper to describe that as a state devoid of conceptual knowledge too. Regarding a human being who is endowed with the capacity or power of speaking, while telling others, we may say that — "This person does not know how to speak". But no wise or rational person, whosoever he may be, can say — "This stone does not know how to speak". For, the stone does not possess the capacity or power of speaking at all. Similarly, it becomes inappropriate to say — "The speech does not know how to speak"; for, speech is a phenomenon which is possessed by others; there is no

Rarest Archive

necessity for speech to possess or beget speech. Similarly, if it is said — "In deep sleep there does not exist knowledge" — it will amount to interpreting it as saying either that in deep sleep we do not possess the capacity or power of getting knowledge or that we do not have the necessity of getting knowledge alone, but not as saying — 'Although there was a possibility of getting knowledge, we did not get the knowledge'. For, in deep sleep there is never any possibility of any conceptual knowledge whatsoever accruing.

125 In deep sleep we do not exist in an innate nature of insentience nor do we exist in an innate nature of essencelessness:

As stated above, because in deep sleep there is no probability of any conceptual knowledge whatsoever accruing, then (i.e. in deep sleep) our essential nature is gross or insentient — Thus the Logicians of the School of **Vaisheshika Philosophy** were saying. Even today some common people might be thinking in that manner alone. Some Buddhists who were protagonists of **Shoonyavaada or theory of** essencelessness were said to be contending that because in deep sleep there was no knowledge whatsoever, then in deep sleep our essential nature itself did not exist. It need not be gainsaid that these two theories are opposed or contradictory to reason as well as experience. For, to think or conceive that — "In deep sleep we who were of aninsentient nature — just as a wick is dipped in oil and then is lighted up — after getting awake, by virtue of some particular external cause a new characteritic

Rarest Archive

entered in us and the light of knowledge manifested itself" — is not in agreement or in consonance with reason; there is no support of experience also to that. No one believes too that in deep sleep we become devoid of knowledge or consciousness just like a dry or withered block of wood. Even now the block of wood is not sentient, in the future too, despite whatever attempts, it will not get either its own knowledge or the knowledge of the external objects. But as soon as we wake up from deep sleep we get the knowledge or consciousness of the divisions or distinctions of the type — 'I' and 'another'. Therefore, it cannot be accepted that in deep sleep we existed in an insentient nature or state. To say also that — "There in deep sleep we ourselves became non-existent" — is a ridiculous statement. If anyone had such feeling about deep sleep, why were people showing or entertaining so much eagerness or fervour for such a thing like deep sleep? No one, whosoever he may be, keeps thinking in the manner — 'Oh God; If by chance deep sleep accrues to us and if we ourselves become non-existent, then what will be our plight or predicament?" On the other hand, there are many people, in fact who become anxious in the manner — "Whether we get deep sleep at all or not!" Anticipating that in deep sleep they would get a certain immense benefit, there are people who adopt the necessary devices or plans for obtaining it, and such people we come across everywhere. Therefore, to say that in deep sleep we become of an essenceless nature also is devoid of reason. Let this be. If our becoming insentient in deep sleep is itself true, or our becoming of an essenceless nature alone is true, then on waking up we describe that deep sleep state in the manner — "In deep sleep

Rarest Archive

I had a very quiet, peaceful rest". How can this be appropriate or proper? What does it mean to say that what is not experienced is described?- (*Maandukya Bhaashya* 7). For this reason, in deep sleep we exist in the eesential or innate nature of Pure Consciousness alone; then this Pure or Absolute Consciousness or Knowledge, which is our core of Being or essential nature of existence, is not like the conceptual knowledge with objectivity or with distinctive characteristics or features — This alone becomes .the philosophical truth or teaching.

126. There is no division in the Pure Consciousness or Knowledge of deep sleep:

It is determired that deep sleep means a state devoid of distinctive knowledges, is it not? But being devoid of distinctive knowledges is itself not its innate nature. In waking and dream, in which there are the divisions of the type — 'I' and 'the rest', the 'I' notion is itself the substrate for knowledge; if the 'I' notion is devoid of transactions, then it is but natural that the knowledges of the type — 'I' and 'the rest' cannot accrue. But this much alone is not the innate nature of deep sleep. Therein there exists a certain 'entity' which is devoid of the divisions of the type — 'I' and 'the rest'; which is that 'entity'? We should know it. Although in deep sleep there does not exist the distinctive knowledges or knowledge with divisions, there exists Pure Consciousness; on the strength of that Pure Conscicusness alone we say that there a 'knowledge without divisions' exists, is it not? Which is that 'Knowledge or Consciousness? Of

Rarest Archiver

which object is It the Knowledge ? — These questions arise in us naturally. But these questions are prompted by the waking viewpoint alone. After it is stated that in deep sleep there does not exist any divisions whatsoever, on whichb asis are the questions — "Which is that knowledge or consciousness ?" and "Of which object is it the knowledge ? ' — sustained ? In deep sleep there does not at all exist any divisions of the type of subject and object. It is true that in the waking the object and the subject are separate ; but even then, knowingly or unknowingly the feeling that there must be a certain close reletionship between them is deep-rooted invariably in all of us. For instance, "The subject (i. e. *Jnaatru* or the knower) being myself, by virtue of my knowledge, which is my characteristic feature, I know the object" — in this manner we have a feeling, is it not ? But how did the belief that — "To the subject the knowledge of the object, which in quite different from it, accrues" — germinate in us ? In the waking and the dream it appears as though 'the knower' and 'the known' are of extremely opposite natures. The knower appears to be an object to the consciousness of 'I', independent and sentient ; the known appears to be an object to the consciousness of 'this', illumined by the distinctive or empirical knowledge which is within the control or command of the knower, and is insentient. Thus although these two are of extremely different natures, by the knowledge of the knower the known becomes objectified or cognized indeed. Although there is no relationship whatsoever between these two, what can be the secret of the phenomenon that one is known by the other ? Howevermuch deeply this question is deliberated upon from the waking view-

Rarest Archive

point alone, there cannot be any solution; this viewpoint, without in the least the essential truth of either the knowledge or of the known being established on firm ground, arrests all our intellectual power or capacity. But it suffices if we just turn our attention a little towards deep sleep; all the difficulties regarding this consideration disappear into thin air. Although the knower and the known seem to be phenomena of such different natures from the waking viewpoint, the fact that both of them are invariably our essential natures alone has to be known by us by observing deep sleep alone. Because the knower and the known are both thus the two different forms of one and the same Ultimate Reality alone, between the two it is possible for one to know the other. To all of us it is being felt that these two being the bifurcated rivulets of one and the same river of the essential nature of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness, both of them have to perforce meet at a particular juncture. Meeting in such a manner is seen in deep sleep. Both the phenomena of 'I' and 'the rest' have to be essentially together in the waking and the dream with the relationship of knowledge or consciousness; but in the Pure Consciousness which we in our common parlance call 'deep sleep', the phenomena of 'I', 'the rest', 'knowledge' — all these have become one and the same Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness or Knowledge. On the strength of this Pure Consciousness or Knowledge alone we are indeed cognizing the divisions of 'I' and 'the rest' in the remaining two states; on the strength of this alone we are capable of saying, as soon as we wake up, that — 'In deep sleep there did

Rarest Archive

not exist any divisions of the object and the subject whatsoever'.

127. In the Pure Consciousness of deep sleep the 'I' notion does not exist:

In the manner stated above **in deep sleep not only the knower and the known have become one but also the knower and the knowledge have become one.** In the waking the divisions or differences of 'I' and 'my knowledge' exist. But in deep sleep there exists Pure Consciousness or Knowledge alone, devoid of these divisions even. This Knowledge or Consciousness is not of anything at all; It is by Itself independent. It exists in its own essential nature of Being alone; just as the light or lamp and its brilliance or radiance are not different and separate, there in deep sleep our Knowledge or Consciousness and ourselves exist without being separate. In fact, we ourselves are the Pure Consciousness or Knowledge. In a situation where no division whatsoever exists how can even the division of the type of 'I' remain? When we talk about deep sleep in the waking, we do talk in the manner — "I slept for such and such a period; then I did not have the knowledge or consciousness of anything whatsoever." Merely on this account it is not proper to believe that in deep sleep the special feature of 'I' exists; for, the phenomenon or the notion of 'I' thrives by desiderating the divisions of 'you', 'they', 'the world' alone. Without the divisions of 'you' and 'others' the 'I' notion does not exist at all The waking 'I' notion rules, or has its sway, in the waking alone; the dream 'I' notion has its sway in

Rarest Archives

the dream alone; both these two 'I' notions cannot put forward even a single step, so to speak, beyond, or leaving behind, their respective 'habitat' or 'home'. The fact that in deep sleep neither the waking nor the dream exists anywhere at all is indisputable; it is clear that to the statement — "When we are in deep sleep either we are awake or we are seeing a dream" — there is no meaning whatsoever. It being so, how should the waking 'I' or the dream 'I' descend or slip into the deep sleep? This is an improbable eventuality. Even so, we do say — "I slept"! How can this be appropriate? We have once before (sub-section 83) given an answer to this question. In deep sleep we do not exist in the form of 'I'; we exist there in the innate nature of the Ultimate Reality alone which is the essence of all existence and all knowledge or consciousness. In Maandukya Mantra 'Ekee Bhootaha' (one who has become one with all existence), 'Prajnaana Ghanaha' (a lump or *prius* of all knowledge) -- such adjectives or qualifying phrases have been given to *Atman* or the Self of deep sleep for this reason alone. Therefore, it should be understood that for the statement, which we keep on using in the waking, of the type — "I slept" — the reason is the fact that the Pure Consciousness of deep sleep is the very essence of the 'I' notion alone; in that Consciousness because the 'I' notion also has become *'Ekee Bhootaha'* or one with It alone, the consideration or scrutiny of the type— 'I slept' -- is accruing to, or arising in, us. Forgetting this truth, some people are adamantly holding the opinion that in deep sleep the 'I' is really existing separately without doubt. But if by the mere scrutiny or examination of the 'I' notion which we get in the waking

Rarest Archive

it is to be surmised that in deep sleep the 'I' notion exists, then by the consideration or scrutiny of the type — "I slept for such and such a period or time" — we will also have to believe that in deep sleep there existed time as well as the function or action of 'sleeping' also, is it not ? To say that — 'Let it also be true' — will amount to exhibiting pride in the waking logic alone and not relying on the experience of deep sleep itself. While viewing the deep sleep from the waking standpoint, it is but natural to think that deep sleep was an event which had happened in the past time and then, considering it as a past experience related to us, to think that the present scrutiny or consideration, which is being carried out, as the memory of deep sleep ; it is also useful for the waking transactions. But the fact that this belief is contradictory to the comprehensive or plenary Intuitive experience can be discerned by the previous method (sub-section 120) of consideration delineated with regard to memory of the dream. If that method is followed, the fact that — 'Here in deep sleep too *Atman* alone, who is the Witness for both the states of waking and dream, is common' — will become clear. But here there is a special feature: That is : In the experience of the dream apart from the Witness, the dream state and the dream world too, which are the witnessed phenomena, are also existing ; but in deep sleep, on the other hand, any such witnessed phenomenon whatsoever is not seen at all. There are no time, space, causation categories seen ; the divisions of either any objects or knowledges too do no exist ; neither there exists at all the empirical experience showing distinctive features or characteristics like — 'such and such a thing we are knowing' ; nor 'nothing is known at

Rarest Archive

all'; nor finally showing by separating in the manner — 'I' and 'this'. Because it is like this, Sri Sureshwaraachaarya (one of the direct disciples of Adi Shenkaraachaarya) has said: "In deep sleep the distinctive knowledge as in the waking does not exist; therefore, the statement to the effect — 'I did not know anything then' — is not memory at all; for, therein time, space etc. do not come in between; what meaning is there to a statement — 'That entity which exists in itself and by itself belongs to the past period of time?' " — (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 1-4-300). The purport of this *Vaartika* is: If there should be a memory of the type — "I did not know anything whatsoever in deep sleep" — in deep sleep there must have occurred a knowledge of the type — "I am not knowing anything now". By that experience a latent impression should have been formed, thereafter from that latent impression the memory should accrue. But in deep sleep the inner instrument or *Antahkarana*, i. e. the mind, itself does not exist. This being the case, how can there occur at all any empirical or distinctive knowledge or experience? From that how can at all the latent impression be caused? In deep sleep there does not exist time itself, in which manner can the experience of deep sleep be said to belong to the past period of time? For some present-day Vedantins to argue in the manner — "Because the experience of the type — 'In deep sleep I was not knowing anything whatsoever so far' — does occur, Jeeva ('I'), time, Ajnaana or ignorance — all these three existed then in deep sleep" — the reason is their lack of capacity to ratiocinate alone or discern as to which aspects of the waking knowledge have been mixed up in the

Rarest Archive

memory of deep sleep. If the experience of deep sleep is examined as it is, then *Atman* alone exists therein. The fact that — 'Time, knowledge and forgetfulness — all have become *Atman* alone' — will become crystal clear. It being so, how can it be accepted that all of them. are objects to the experience of the past period of time ? Apart from this, *Atman* or the Self is the Witness of all states, all times and spaces, all knowledges and forgetful natures ; it being so, how can He be related at all to the past time ? Therefore, like the silver which appears in the sea-shell or nacre, a particular Vikalpa or misconception alone which appears in (or is superimposed on) *Atman* or the Self who exists by Himself appears as memory of the type — "I did not know anything whatsoever in deep sleep". - (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika 4-4-301*). This alone is the correct decision or conclusion. Therefore, in deep sleep 'I' does not exist, 'you' does not exist, 'another' does not exist, the knowledge of the distinctive features like 'I', 'you' 'another' does not exist ; the Pure Consciousness alone, which is 'conscious' without knowing that none of these exist and which is the very essence of all these, exists.

128. Apart from Pure Consciousness the other states do not exist at all :

Though we have used so far an expression of the type — "The Pure Consciousness that exists in deep sleep" — in reality, the Pure Consciousness does not 'exist' in deep sleep. If observed properly, the deep sleep phenomenon is not a state at all ! It is Pure

Rarest Archives

Consciousness alone. The statement that it is a state also is a conception imagined from the waking view-point. Assume that there were two small boats in a big ocean; just as the people who are sitting in one of these boats, looking at the portion of water around their boat where there is no boat, conceive or believe that 'there no boat whatsoever exists', similarly we, who are sitting in the boats called waking and dream which are plying on the ocean of Pure Consciousness, are believing or conceiving that 'deep sleep is a state in which nothing is known'; just as below the boats also that very ocean exists, for our waking and dream also Pure Consciousness alone is the substrate. Though for illustration here the waking and the dream have been called boats, just like the wooden boats float on water, the waking and the dream themselves — having been made of any queer material — do not appear on the top of Pure Consciousness; if needed for the purposes of understanding, they may be conceived to be 'boats of ice'. If observed more incisively or deeply, there are no two states like 'waking' and 'dream'; for, they are not two events which occur with regularity or one after the other in any one time series whatsoever; nor are they entities which exist one by the side of the other in any one space series. Therefore, application of the principle of numeration to them is itself not proper. Just as the water bubbles are all water alone, the phenomena of waking and dream are all Pure Consciousness alone — at the top, at the bottom, internally and externally. We are calling Pure Consciousness alone 'states'. When viewed from the standpoint of the Ultimate Reality (or of Pure Consciousness) neither waking nor dream, nor any other state whatsoever exists at all. Everything is the

Rarest Archives

non-dual ocean of Pure Consciousness alone devoid of any waves or banks. This eternal stateless Pure Consciousness has been called 'the fourth *Atman*' in the *Maandukya Upanishad.* 'The fourth one' means an entity which has not even the least taint or traces of the three states at any time whatsoever.

129. To say that Pure Consciousness does not exist at all is dry logic:

Pure Consciousness means knowledge or consciousness devoid of any quality or characteristics and devoid of any objects or any support whatsoever. It is not possible at all for such a knowledge or consciousness to exist; for, no one among us has ever seen at all knowledge without object. 'Existence', 'knowledge' — both these are relative terms; it being so, is it possible to include or merge both of them in knowledge alone? As much as the existence which can exist by itself without the knowledge or consciousness, which is the subject, is improbable, so much improbable is the knowledge which can exist without any object with existence. Apart from this, after the knowledge is obtained, in it there should be perforce a characteristic or quality of the type — "such and such a knowledge". Even if it is said that no other quality or characteristic exists, to that knowledge at least the quality or characteristic of existence should invariably be accepted, is it not? Then it will amount to accepting the difference of 'knowledge' and 'existence' in it alone. Therefore, the knowledge devoid of buality, object, support, division, difference is itself

Rarest Archive

a concept which does not exist anywhere in the world — thus some poeple do argue in a perverse manner.

To realize that all this is the logic that has arisen because of the defect of the waking viewpoint, the experience of the deep sleep, which we have described so far, alone is sufficient. When in deep sleep we do have the experience of the Pure Consciousness, if a perverse logic or argument is made to the effect that it i.e. the experience of the Pure Consciousness, does not exist — then for that kind of logic the fruit is *Atma Hatya* or slaying (i.e, self-denial) of one's own Being. In the same manner, in states like Samaadhi, swoon and intoxicated or inebriated state etc. also the experience of Pure Consciousness subsists; if people who have woken up from such states are asked — "Describe the essential or innate nature of your experience?" — then, they will say that nothing whatsoever was observable to them. Because *Samaadhi*, swoon — such states are experienced rarely by a few people, and for the present topic deep sleep alone which is in everyone's experience is sufficient, the deliberation on those both states (i.e. *Samaadhi* and swoon) is not needed in the present context. By the examination of those states, for the knowledge of the Vedantic Truth what benefit or danger may be caused? — This topic can be analysed satisfactorily, but it is not quite relevant here, nor is it needed. If the experience of deep sleep is fully analysed, we come to know that therein an absolute or transcendental Intuitive experience alone, devoid of any object or any division whatsoever, existed. This alone we

Rarest Archives

have called Pure Consciousness or Knowledge. Thus to refute what is based on or supported by experience by means of logic cannot be proper. The doubt of the type — "We have not at all seen Pure Consciousness anywhere !' — arises only in people who cannot Intuit the essential nature of Pure Consciousness. For, Pure Consciousness is not an object. Whatever things we know, none of them is the essential or innate nature of Pure Consciousness. That Entity to which both the waking , and dream are objects, that Witness alone is the real Pure Consciousness. As stated in the previous section, both the waking and the dream are the false appearances that are projected in Pure Consciousness. The truth or reality of those appearances too is Pure Consciousness alone. Thus when Pure Consciousness alone is everything, Pure Consciousness alone is ourselves; if at all we are not able to see Pure Consciousness by objectifying It, what defect is there at all ? By this it does not become established in the least that Pure Consciousness which is our essential or innate nature of Being is Itself non-existent, is it not ? If the fact that 'Pure Consciousness is not an object at all' is remembered, this kind of delusions are not born. By our statement that Pure Consciousness is not an object the meaning that 'It is a mere subject alone' should not be construed. 'For, when an object which is apart from It (i. e. Pure Consciousness) is itself not existing at all, how can the question of Pure Consciousness being a subject arise at all ? Although Pure Consciousness alone appears as the 'Witness' and the 'witnessed' in the waking and the dream, even at that moment too It is really existing in Its essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness alone. In deep sleep especially the false appearance of

Rarest Archive

the 'Witness' and the 'witnessed' does not exist at all. In fact, people are dealing with Pure Consciousness alone, which does not know or have even the taint of the divisions of subject and object, as 'deep sleep' in their day-to-day life.

130. Pure Consciousness is neither mutable nor immutable. In It the misconceptions of the type of number, quality and form also do not exist:

Because it has been stated that Pure Consciousness is an Entity without any misconceptions of the type of — time, space, causation, 'I' notion, 'you' notion, object, subject etc. — by this itself it amounts to saying that It is neither mutable nor immutable. For, from the standpoint of those who believe that deep sleep is a state and that in it Pure Consciousness — devoid of subject-object division — having first existed, has got transformed in the waking and the dream into the subject and the object — It, i. e. Pure Consciousness, seems to be mutable. It will also have to be admitted that as the essential nature of the Witness which is observing or objectifying all the three states Pure Consciousness is also immutable. But what is meant by saying that Pure Consciousness, which is devoid of time and space and which is, in fact, the very essence Itself of time and space, is susceptible to change or changes? In It there are no divisions, no limbs or parts; how can It at all change? Pure Consciousness alone is appearing in the forms of deep sleep, dream and waking but not that It is changed or transformed into the forms of these states; It does

Rarest Archive

not have within Itself any cause whatsoever which can bring about a change ; an external thing, especially, which can cause It to change cannot exist at all ; for, Pure Consciousness is an Entity devoid of the three kinds of distinctions or differences of the type — *Sajaateeya* or of the same species, *Vijaateeya* or belonging to other species, *Swagata* or innately existing within it or inhering in itself. Even to imagine such an indivisible or consummate Absloute Consciousness to be mutable or divisible — it is not possible at all. Thus because it has been stated that in Pure Consciousness there is no possibility of any change whatsoever taking place, It has to be called 'immutable' alone, is it not ? But here also the meaning for the words — 'immutable' or 'without change', especially, should be properly understood. For, accepting that certain things or objects which are within the jurisdiction or realm of time are not showing within themselves any change whatsoever and are existing as they are, in order to refer to them there is a practice or convention of using the expression — 'immutable or changeless'. In the statements — "Even if this plantain is kept for one month it will not go bad" — there are causes internally in the plantain as well as externally to it for its change ; even so, it remains unchanged or immutable for one month — in this manner we think. But in this sense or meaning also Pure Consciousness is not immutable or changeless. In It there is no cause whatsoever for bringing about change. We have just now stated that externally to It also there does not exist any cause for Its change. Not only this. Illumining all those things or objects which are subject to the division of the types of 'being with change' and 'being devoid of change' in the object's

Rarest Archives

qualities or characteristics is this Pure Consciousness; if observed more incisively or deeply, that Entity which has within itself and in its own nature itself concealed all the gamut or totality of objects or concepts like change, the thing in which the change has occurred, time etc., which are the causes for the change, disintegration etc., and yet remains or exists in Its non-dual innate or essential nature is Itself this Pure Consciousness. Therefore, if observed from the manner in which they are used with regard to empirical objects, the two words or expressions, viz. *Savikaara* or mutable or changing and *Nirvikaara* or immutable or devoid of change — too do not suit Pure Consciousness. In the same manner, Pure Consciousness is not one, i.e. the word 'Monism' does not suit It, nor is It many; is not with qualities or *Suguna* nor without qualities or *Nirguna*; is not with form or *Saakaara*, nor without form or *Niraakaara*; because all these are the qualities or characteristics of an empirical object, it should be decided that they cannot in the least affect or taint Pure Consciousness, which is devoid of the object-subject division.

131. Doubt regarding the ignorance or lack of knowledge about Pure Consciousness:

Now another consideration will have to be made here. It has been stated previously (sub-section 128) that because they have not known Pure Consciousness alone, It is being dealt with as deep sleep by people, is it not? In this statement there are two aspects or parts implicit: 1. All that exists is Pure Consciousness alone; but people are not knowing It. 2. Because of

Rarest Archives

the reason that they have not known It (i.e. Pure Consciousness) properly alone, people are misconceiving It as deep sleep. Here, not knowing the Pure Consciousness, and misconceiving or wrongly knowing It — concerning these two aspects or parts alone it is now being expounded or elucidated. What is the essential nature of these aspects? What is meant by 'properly knowing' Pure Consciousness? What is the reason or cause for people not knowing Pure Consciousness? Merely because they have not known It, what is the reason for their wrongly knowing or misconceiving It? How 'is it possible to 'know' It properly? If it is stated that Pure Consciousness can be known, then does it not amount to saying that Pure Consciousness too may become an object for knowledge? Then, to the philosophical truth that 'Pure Consciousness is not an object' there will be danger or threat, is it not? Having said so far that Pure Consciousness knows everything, now if it is said that there is a necessity of knowing It too — does it not amount to contradiction? For argument's sake, even if it is accepted that somehow we can know Pure Consciousness, what guarantee is there to believe that That alone is the final knowledge and that another knowledge which can falsify or cancel that Knowledge also cannot arise or be born? If answers to so many questions are not given, the statement that — 'People have taken or understood Pure Consciousness as deep sleep' — cannot become meaningful.

132. The different forms of ignorance :

Therefore, we will commence giving answers to

Rarest Archive

these questions, explaining one by one. In Sanskrit a lack of knowledge, wrong knowledge or misconception — both these are called 'Avidya' or ignorance. "Like that or this ?" — doubting in this manner is called 'Samshaya'; "It can be like this" — reasoning in this manner is called 'Sambhaavana'; "It cannot be like this" — negatively reasoning in this manner is called 'Asambhaavana' — All these also are the different forms of not properly knowing only; wrong knowledge or misconception or Vipareeta Bhaavana also is a variant form of a lack of knowledge (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika 1-4-386, 440*). Therefore, first of all **the ignorance of Avidya, which is not knowieg the truth alone**, should be considered. '*Avidya*' or ignorance of the form of 'not knowing' is well-known among the common people the world over with regard to external objects or things. When we are kids so many things are not known to us; as we grow older we come to know more and more things. To those who are scientists, pundits and artists more things are known than are known to others. Even so, it will not be an exaggeration if it is said that in the world more than what aspects of objects that people know there are many aspects of those very objects unknown by them. In the Subhaashita or a wise saying — "Sciences are endless or numberless; things to be known are many; the time available for man to know is small; the obstacles or impediments during that time also are many; therefore, what is essential alone — that alone should be known" — not only are morals stated, but also the fact that the phenomenon that 'the unknown things to man in the world are fathomless' is also mentioned. Even in the things which are known by the people who are said to be scientists, some aspects

Rarest Archive

seem to be beyond the ken of logic or reasoning of man; in spite of the concerted efforts of pundits or scholars to know the secret or the inner truth of phenomena like the physical substance, mind. energy or power, knowledge, time, space, causation etc. it has not been possible for them to go beyond certain limits. Therefore, having assumed them to exist as they appear to be to ona's experience in the empirical or day-to-day transactions alone, the scientists have endeavoured to build up their sciences. This is the **Avidya or ignorance which is of the type of not knowing or a lack of knowledge** regarding the objects. In the same manner, the philosophers or truth-seekers have been from a long time considering or deliberating upon the question — "What is meant by 'Pure Consciousness'?" Even so, it has not been solved by them. Some people say or assert that It does not exist at all; some others say that if anything is grasped or reckoned in a general form of 'knowledge', that alone is Pure or Absolute Consciousness or Knowledge, without taking into account the phenomena of 'our knowledge', 'Your knowledge' — while knowing empirical objects or gaining knowledge like 'such and such characteristics or qualities'. People of both these categories do not really know the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness or Knowledge In the same way, it may be stated that all those who without knowing It, i. e. Pure Consciousness, have formed different conceptions about it do not know Pure or Absolute Consciousness. This alone is the **'Avidya' or ignorance of the nature or form of not nowing Atman or one's innate nature of Being or the Self.** Here what is said to be 'not known' is the characteristic of the *Antahkarana* or the inner instrument of the mind,

Rarest Archives

which is related to us in the waking.

Now we will explain the nature of Avidya or ignorance which is of the type of wrong knowledge or misconception. This ignorance too is well-knowh in the world as occurring with regard to external objects. Every-day phenomena like taking or knowing a rope to be a snake, knowing a sea-shell or nacre as silver, thinking or conceiving alum to be sugar etc. — all these are appearing invariably before us. Although the mind conceives the various perceptions like sound, touch etc. which are received by us through the senses, unless and until the intellectual faculty gathers together all those different conceptions and decides that 'it is such and such an object', we do not obtain the knowledge of the object or thing. The intellect of a person who has known that — "If a thing is endowed with 'such and such a colour', 'such and such a smell', 'such and such a food', 'such and such a taste' it is a grape" — when it (that intellect) is seeing from a distance even, it decides instantly the object to be a grape. But on certain occasions or circumstances this intellect happens to know the grapes in a picture too to be real grapes. (In the Epic — '*Mahabhaarata*' — Duryodhana conceiving a door to exist where it did not exist really in the palace of Dharmaraaya, and where it really existed conceiving that there it did not exist, his misconceiving a floor to have existed where actually water was there, and having been deluded, to mistake a mere floor itself for water — all these are wrong knowledges or misconceptions of this type alone). On certain occasions, because of a defect in the eye, instances of one moon itself being

Rarest Archive

misconceived to be two or more are also seen. All these delusions are misconceptions alone, i. e. mistaking one for another.

Whatever has bsen stated so far is the *Avidya* or ignorance which is of the type of wrong knowledge or misconception with regard to external objects. In the same manner, without 'knowing' as to what is Pure or Absolute Consciousness is, 'conceiving' that Pure Consciousness either as waking or dream has became quite natural among people. Here not knowing Pure Consciousness alone is 'deep sleep'; it can be called **Kaaranaavidya or causal ignorance.** In addition to this, 'I', 'another', 'real', 'unreal or false' — in this manner to know or conceive Pure Consciousness alone is waking and dream; this can be called **'Kaaryaavidya or resultant ignorance'** (*Gaudapaada Kaarika* 1-11). Because 'not knowing' the Ultimate Reality is a mere non-existent category, in that form though it can be stated that *Avidya* or ignorance is not a cause for misfortunes or calamities, that same *Avidya* when it assumes the form or nature of wrong knowledge or misconception it causes innumerable calamities or catastrophies. Although in the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness or Knowledge there does not exist any divisions whatsover, this *Avidya* formulates or projects divisions of the type — 'I' and 'the rest'; it causes to conceive or believe the external world as the ultimate truth and that the external world exists always; it causes to feel or think that 'I am very small in the world' and that 'I will exist only for a brief period only'; having attached the characteristics

Rarest Archives

of qualities of the external objects to its own essential nature of Pure Being and superimposing on it characteristics like birth, growth, ematiation, death etc. — all these are the 'sports' or 'free play' alone of the misconception which is this resultant ignorance or *Kaaryaavidya* All these are called by the name of **'Adhyaasa' or misconception or delusion by the Vedantins. This wrong knowledge or misconception too is the characteristic of the internal instrument of the mind alone.**

133. There is no other cause for the 'causal ignorance or Kaaranaavidya':

Now we will state the answer to the question — "What is the reason for not knowing the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness?" In this question it is assumed that there must be a cause for 'not knowing' any object whatsoever. But in the world such a state of affairs is not seen anywhere. Not knowing objects alone is 'natural' to people; to people who want to have knowledge either by their own deliberation or ratiocination or through the instructions or guidance of others, knowledge accrues. This fact has been accepted by all scientists or logicians In any science, for that matter, any new topic or subject-matter not known to the people is endeavoured to be made known alone, but it is not stated therein 'why' that particular topic or subject-matter is not known to the people at all. In the same way, in the scientific or philosophical texts dealing with the Ultimate Reality also it is proper or reasonable to anticipate the teaching of the method or system as to how the 'Knowledge' of the Ultimate

Rarest Archiver

Reality can be attained, but it will not be proper or reasonable to ask that the cause for people not having that knowledge should be stated. Here also it is justifiable to assume that quite naturally alone people do not know the Ultimate Reality. Apart from this, the question — "What is the cause for *Avidya* or ignorance ?" — is not one which a person who does not know the Ultimate Reality can put or pose. If it is contented or argued that — "One can ask in the manner — 'In me, who is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness, how did *Avidya* or ignorance of the type of 'not knowing' arise ?', is it not ?" — a counter-argument can be posed — "When *Avidya* or ignorance exists where is the knowledge to the effect that 'I am of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness ?" In that state the feeling or belief of the type— "From the beginning itself I am having invariably *Avidya* or ignorance alone" — only exists. And the Intuitive knowledge of the type — "I am of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness" — is not a feeling or conception at all ; the wrong feeling of belief also exists to the effect that — "The misconception of the type - 'I am endowed with body, mind, intellect etc.' — itself is the proper or right knowledge". After the Knowledge of Pure Consciousness is attained also this question cannot be put ; for, then there exists a sense of certitude alone of the type — "*Avidya* or ignorance did not exist in me in the past, does not exist now too, in future too it cannot exist". — (*Naishkarmya Siddhi* 3-116). We have mentioned above itself that *Avidya* or ignorance is a characteristic of the inner instrument of the mind. Therefore, one who has presumed that the inner instrument of the mind which belongs to him in the

Rarest Archive

waking is really his — he alone is called one endowed with Avidya or 'an ignorant person'. By him the knowledge that — 'Pure Consciousness is myself' is never attained at all. When people deliberate upon the three states in the manner we have described so far, then the decision or sense of certitude occurs that — 'I am the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness'. From that viewpoint the phenomenon of *Avidya* or ignorance itself does not exist at all. Therefore, it should be understood that the question regarding the cause for *Avidya* or ignorance is a mere perverse logic or *Kutarka*

Some present-day Vadantins, who are predominantly logic-minded, keep on saying that there exists a certain beginningless veil called Moolaavidya which is the cause for not knowing *Atman* or the Self; that it hides or covers up *Atman* and because of this alone the *Avidyas* or ignorances of the forms of — 'not knowing' and 'wrong knowledge or misconception' as well as 'the world' are produced or projected; it, i e: *Moolaavidya,* exists in the three states too and can be removed by *Jnaana* or knowledge (of the Self or *Atman*). This *Avidya,* i e. *Moolaavidya,* is a mere figment of imagination or a mere logical conception of these protagonists. For the purpose of protecting or fostering the wrong or perverse logic which they have adopted in the manner — 'For the world which is externally perceivable and is the object of the real knowledge or experience and full of real things or entities there must be a certain real or existent form of cause necessary and that without such a cause the world of the form of an effect and endowed with

Rarest Archive

knowledge and material objects cannot be born and appear' — these disputants have hypothetically framed up or formulated this (imaginary) *Avidya* or ignorance, i. e. *Moolaavidya*. Because the world is not another real entity which exists along with the Ultimate Reality, and this world is a *Vivarta* or misconception alone of the Ultimate Reality — the world does not desiderate any cause whatsoever. When the world is the totality of the real and the unreal categories or phenomena, to assme that it is of the real category alone is also not proper. Because space and time, cause and effect — these appear co-existentially with the world, to say that preceding it another cause must be essentially assumed or posited amounts to being illogical. These disputants say that *Avidya* or ignorance exists in both waking and dream, is it not? Because in those states the time series are different, to the question — "To which time series should the *Avidya* or ignorance, which is of the form or nature of a cause, belong?" — these disputants will remain mum without an answer. Apart from this, the wrong knowledge or misconception itself, which is produced as a result of the *Avidva* of the form of 'not knowing the Ultimate Reality' is the cause for the cause-effect concepts. It being so, to say that 'for this *Avidya* or ignorance of the form of misconception too there is a cause' — is the outcome of a lack of discriminative thinking or reasoning regarding the essential nature of the cause-effect concept. This fact is very clear.

The names and forms, which are imagined or misconceived in *Atman* or Pure Consciousness because

Rarest Archives

of *Avidya*, appear as the Ultimate Reality or *Paramaatman* alone till this *Avidya* is removed by *Vidya* or Intuitive Knowledge. The ignorant people have, because of misconception, imagined that these (i. e. names and forms) remain hidden or latent in deep sleep, *Sushupti*, and dissolution of creation or the world, i. e. *Pralaya*, either in the seed form or *Beeja Roopa*, or energy form or *Shakti Roopa*. This seed of names and forms is called by various names like *Maaya, Beeja, Shakti, Prakriti*, etc. in the *Shrutis* or scriptural (*Upanishadic*) texts and *Smritis* or texts written by ancient seers or *Rishis*. The protagonists of *Moolaavidya*, not knowing this secret teaching, are treating or dealing with *'Prakriti'* itself as *Moolaavidya*. In the *Bhashyas* or Adi Shankaraachaarya's original commentaries this *'Maayaavidyaikyavaada'* or the theory of equating *Maaya* and *Avidya* is not to be found anywhere at all (See *Geeta Bhashya* 13–26, *Sutra Bhashya* 2–1–14). Because this *Moolaavidya*, which we have referred or alluded to, is a mere figment of imagination of some disputants, its deliberation is needless for this text or book, which has been presented predominantly based on *Anubhava*' or Intuitive experience, based on the comprehensive or plenary outlook or viewpoint of Pure Consciousness or the Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Atman*. This subject-matter or topic is discussed elaborately and exhaustively in the Sanskrit book — "Moolaavidya Niraasa or Shankara Hridaya" and in the Kannada book — "Shankara Siddhaanta". Therefore, we will leave out this incidental consideration here itself.

Rarest Archive

134. The ignorance or Avidya, which is of the nature of misconceiving the Ultimate Reality is also natural to people :

Now let us take up the question — "Just because the Ultimate Reality is not known, that is misconceived; what is the cause for this ?" — for consideration. Many objects we do not know; even so, we have not misconceived them. We keep on saying — "What it is, I do not know" — only. It being so, merely because the Pure Consciousness is not known, in that we see the world with the divisions of knowledge and its objects ! What is the cause for this ?" — This alone is the real purport of the question. To this question too, it amounts to our having given an answer in the previous section itself. For, just like the *Avidya* or ignorance of the type of not knowing the Ultimate Reality, knowing It wrongly or misconceiving It also is quite natural to people; it is not possible to give or mention any cause for this phenomenon. 'Not knowing the Ultimate Reality' is first, 'knowing It wrongly or misconceiving It' is later— in this sense, we have not at all stated that 'not knowing' is the cause for 'misconceiving or wrongly knowing'; to those who have known properly or correctly, there does not exist any wrong knowledge or misconception at all; in those 'who do not know' only that 'wrong knowledge or misconception' exists. For that reason alone, we have called 'not knowing' the cause and 'misconceiving' the effect. In the statement — "Because milk is a liquid substance, it assumes the form of the utensil in which it exists" — being a liquid substance is first, the characteristic of assuming the form of the utensil in which it exists

Rarest Archive

has accrued to the liquid substance later — in this manner there does not exist any cause-effect relationship at all. In the same manner, in the statement — "Because they have not known only, they misconceive it" — also, to these *Avidyas* or ignorances we have mentioned a 'cause-effect' relationship only. There is no regulation or rule at all that 'if people do not know, they will invariably misconceive'. For, in deep sleep people exist without knowing the Reality, but there they are not knowing It wrongly or misconceiving It. Both these *Avidyas* or ignorances have come adventitiously and quite naturally to people, and not that one is a cause for the other. In the inner instrument of the mind there exists a tendency or proclivity. As a result of that, in general people keep making all objective deliberations with the waking viewpoint alone. To their viewpoint the Ultimate Reality does not ever appear to exist; to them the divisions as well as differences which do not exist in It appear as if they are really existing. This alone is *Avidya.*

There exists a very subtle difference between the *Avidya* or ignorance pertaining to external objects and the *Avidya* or ignorance with regard to the Pure Consciousness which is the essential nature alone of our *Atman* or Self. That is: The *'Avidya'* or ignorance that gets destroyed on knowing the objects through the proper means or *Pramaonas* is the *'Avidya'* or gnorance which exists in time alone in the form of — "Till now I had not known in this manner; now I have come to know" — This is how all of us entertain a belief. But the 'I notion which is the substrate or

Rarest Archiver

foundation for knowing all these things— in the objective, external world— is the result or effect of our 'not knowing the essential nature of our real *Atman* or Self' and, instead, is the effect of our having misconceived It in the form of an individual of the nature of 'I'. This *Avidya* or ignorance with regard to our *Atman* or Self exists invariably in all our mundane or empirical transactions. There does not appear to be any beginning or end to this *Avidya* at all. This *Avidya* we have observed by means of our Intuitive experience alone. After the fruition or consummation of the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality, this *Avidya* is completely rooted out. This subtle consideration has to be followed up with the help and guidance of other texts or knowledgeable persons. But in that very instrument of the mind alone there is another tendency too. That is: If observed from the viewpoint of the comprehensive or plenary Intuitive experience which follows the experiences of the three states, the Ultimate Reality is 'known' to it, i. e. the mind, as it exists in its essential nature of *'Satchid Roopa'* or the essential nature of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness; *Avidya* or ignorance is 'falsified', i. e. both the innate ignorance of 'not knowing the Self' and its misconception in the form of *'Adhyaasa'* lose their hold and disappear or vanish. This 'Knowledge' or Intuitive experience of the Self alone is Vidya. This is also the characteristic of the inner instrument of the mind alone. When observed from the viewpoint of *Avidya* alone, space, time and causation etc. appear and for this reason we say that the cause-effect relationship too is an 'effect'. When the question — "What is the cause for *Avidya?*" — is being put, *Ayidya* or ignorance has to be made the

Rarest Archives

object apart from us, is it not? It is not possible to make it like that at all; for, to put the question also the inner instrument of the mind which is endowed with the characteristics of *'Avidya'* and *'Vidya'* or ignorance and knowledge, respectively, has to be assumed to be our own. By some chance let us also imagine that somehow we come to know that — 'In us there is no relationship whatsoever with the mind and that we can put the question too'; but then, because in us there does not exist any *Avidya* or ignorance at all, the cause-effect relationship too, which is the effect or result of *Avidya,* will not exist. For that reason alone, we had previously (sub-section 133) stated that the question about the cause was having the blemish or defect of being perverse logic.

135. It is possible to 'know' or Intuit Pure Consciousness also :

"Is it possible to 'know' Pure Consciousness properly? While knowing it, because It has to become an object, Its very innate nature itself has to change, is it not? How to know the Pure Consciousness Itself which keeps on knowing everything all the time?"— Giving an answer to this question (sub-section 131), we will conclude this Chapter. Because Pure Consciousness is our essential nature of Being alone, there is no need at all of really 'knowing' It; for, man generally aspires to know that which is not his essential nature alone (*Geeta Bhashya* 2-16). Even so, in the present context as a result of 'the nuisance or harassment' of the waking viewpoint one's essential nature of Being alone has

Rarest Archives

become as if 'It is far away from us'. Althougoh one is, in essence, the Pure Consciousness alone, a steadfast or deep-rooted belief exists as though a division in the form of 'I' and 'the rest' has taken place and by one's knowledge the rest is being known. It is true that in deep sleep therein is no room or scope for this belief, for therein Pure Consciousness alone which is devoid of any division whatsoever exists in itself, by itself (i. e. in its Pure or Absolute nature of Being). But there an instrument needed to know Pure Consciousness does not exist. If both the eyes of a person are tied up with a bandage and he is taken round inside an extremely beautiful palace, how can the knowledge of the beauty of it accrue to him? Similarly, when one who is instilled with the waking viewpoint bound up with *Avidya* goes to deep sleep, although there he 'attains' everyday the form or nature of Pure Consciousness alone, that 'object' of Pure Consciousness remains unknown to him. Just as to the people who do not know the geological nature of earth, although they are running about over a gold mine itself, the fact that 'therein, deep in the ground, there exists gold' remains unknown; in the same manner, although they are of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness alone (at the core), in deep sleep although they are immersed and 'drowned' in the ambrosial waters of Pure Consciousness only' its Knowledge itself is denied to them (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 8-3-2). For this reason, in the waking itself a kind of 'Intuitive Knowledge' is very much essential. To indicate exclusively the fact that — "By the deliberation from the viewpoint of the comprehensive or plenary Intuitive experience of the *Saakshi* or Witness (Self or *Atman*) it is possible to acquire or attain such a 'Knowledge' alone" — we

Rarest Archive

have written this book.

"If to the waking knowledge the Pure Consciousness becomes an object, does it not amount to Its very essential nature Itself being changed? How can Pure Consciousness be known at all by this kind of knowledge?" — Now let us examine this objection. First of all, let us leave aside Pure Consciousness and begin the deliberation of the waking knowledge itself. The fact that 'to this knowledge there must invariably be an object' is already known to us. When we know a book, in our inner instrument of the mind a definite concept or *Pratyaya* (with a sense of certitude) of the knowledge of the book is born, is it not? Here it is clear that the book especially is quite different from the mind. But what about the definite or distinct concept or *Pratyaya*? Because it arises, or is caused, in the mind alone, it is not possible to say that it is different or separate from it. But because of obtaining this definite concept in order to know the book, has the mind become mutilated or affected even a little bit? No. If we desire, immediately we can give up the book and if we choose to have the knowledge of a pen, then we can be ready to create a definite concept or *Pratyaya* of it. Now suppose without any external object being there this knowledge or consciousness started to know itself by itself. Here with the help of which object does the inner instrument of the mind create a definite concept or *Pratyaya*? By itself alone. Just now having been a knower or subject, it has itself become an object too. It is knowing as the subject or knower, and as the object it is giving rise to a

Rarest Archive

definite or distinct concept or *Pratyaya.* Therefore, as much as the definite or concrete concept of the form of the book is real, so much real alone is the mental conceptual form too. Because this is seen in experience of everyone, it is not possible at all to say that it is not so. Because for the waking consciousness there must perforce be some object or other, in case there is no external object for it, it will have to keep itself as its own object at least. In general, because for the waking mind it is but natural to be extroverted alone, for people who are not aspiring practitioners of spiritual enlightenment it becomes difficult to attain the ability to remain for a long time by making their own consciousness as an object by themselves alone. Therefore, in such circumstances, more often than not, deep sleep alone is obtained. It is said that rarely to some people who practise concentration in this manner a state called 'Samaadhi' is attained. But because we have now taken up as the basis for consideration universal or everyone's experience alone, that topic is not wanted or needed in the present context.

Let it be so. As we have stated so far, giving up the attempt of knowing the waking consciousness or knowledge, let us make an attempt to know or Intuit Pure Consciousness Itself. Now how should that Pure Consciousness be brought before us as an object? As we have described so far many times, we will have to 'contemplate' on It, i. e. Pure Consciousness, in the same manner as It is the experience of every-one of us and also as It exists in deep sleep, is it not? Here there is a salient feature, and that is: For knowing the waking consciousness it is enough if we

Rarest Archives

conceive or think that 'It is itself a knower or subject and itself an object'; for, in the waking 'knowing' means the transaction alone of assuming the relationship of object and subject. Here for each knower or subject its respective object has to exist perforce. But it is not so in the case of Pure Consciousness. If we have to realize or cognize Its essential nature, we will have to conceive or imagine in the mind the essential nature of Being which we have experienced in deep sleep; our present waking consciousness will have to get rid of or give up its subjectivity. But if it gives up its subjectivity, immediately it will itself become the Pure Consciousness, which is beyond the relationship of subject-object. If it is not so, then it will never be possible to contemplate on either the deep sleep experience, which has become a non-dual Entity, or the Absolute Reality of Pure Consciousness. There is a belief amidst us that by contemplation a kind of an insect belonging to the species of a wasp becomes a wasp alone; but there, the insect is separate and the wasp is separate. In that manner unless we have seen in our experience that a different creature becoming another different creature, that phenomenon does not become fit to be believed. But in the present context, what we are stating is not such an impossible or improbable act at all. Our waking consciousness exists really even now as Pure Consciousness alone; its objectivity is merely the illusory form or nature endowed with names and forms. Really names and forms too are Pure Consciousness alone. This fact is established by the experience of everything 'merging' in Pure Consciousness in deep sleep. Therefore, one who desires or aspires to know or intuit the Ultimate Reality, of the essential nature

Rarest Archive

of Pure Consciousness — to him, then, the Pure Consciousness does not remain as an object; merely by contemplating upon the fact that Pure Consciousness is object-less (or devoid of any objectivity) it will by itself give up objectivity and becomes, as it were, Pure Consciousness — "One who knows *Brahman* becomes *Brahman* alone" (*Mandaka Upanishad* 3-2-9). Therefore, it is possible to know or Intuit Pure Consciousness; by saying so, there is no harm whatsoever done to the philosophical (Vedantic) teaching of the Ultimate Reality, no opposition or contradiction whatsoever to everyone's or universal Intuitive experience.

130 The greatness of the Intuitive experience or knowledge of the Ultimate Reality:

Because Pure Consciousness alone is assuming or putting on the garb of everything and is appearing to the waking viewpoint, *Avidya* or ignorance too in its real nature is Pure Consciousness alone (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 2-1-174). For that reason alone, in the day-to-day world the delusory knowledge or misconceived knowledge too, during its sway, is appearing as the correct or proper knowledge alone. Even when its form is changed and it assumes another form of knowledge, it is the same case. In the workaday world in this manner all knowledge in its essential nature of Being or Absolute Reality having been Pure Consciousness alone, though during its respective appearence it appears to be the real knowledge alone, there is one special feature or significance in the Intuitive knowledge of the Ultimate Reality of Atman or the Self which man has to attain in the final Beatitude. That is: That Intuitive knowledge or

Rarest Archive

experience, removing the particular feature of the type — 'I know' — and dissolving every characteristic of the type — the knower, the knowledge and the known object— converts everything into Pure Consciousness (Gaudapaada Kaarika 4-1). In that Intuitive knowledge because there does not exist any duality at all (*Gaudapaada Kaarika* 1-18), then about the Intuitive knowledge there does not exist any doubt of the type — 'Is it proper (or correct) or wrong?' In this way, because It is extremely certain (or is the very embodiment of Reality and certitude) to call that Intuitive experience or knowledge of Pure Consciousness alone as Vidya or Knowledge is legitimate or justifiable. When compared to It, all the remaining (empirical) knowledges is Avidya or ignorence alone.

137. The correct inference or recognition that the Ultimate Reality apart from being of the nature of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness is also of the nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss:

In this Chapter although we have been considering the Ultimate Reality mainly from the viewpoint of Pure Consciousness alone, we have kept on showing that there does not exist any difference whatsoever between Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness. Both Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness having been one and the same and because that very non-dual Reality is our ensential nature of Being alone, we entertain reverence and love for its consideration more than all other things. Just as in deep sleep our nature becomes Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness, It becomes Pure Happiness or Bliss too therein, and this

Rarest Archive

fact is clear from the latent impression of happiness which has followed us even after we have woken up from sleep as well as from the pleasant or cheerful state of the mind. From this alone although it can be correctly inferred that just as It is the Absolute Reality or Truth of our consciousness or knowledge as well as existence that appear in the waking, the Absolute Reality or Truth of the happiness appearing here in deep sleep also must be the same Entity i. e. the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or the Self, — making an elaborate examination with regard to happiness also cannot be without benefit. For, if our essential nature of Being is, just as it is Pure Existence and Pure Consciousnsss, also Pure Happiness or Bliss, then it will amount to our attaining the supreme goal of human existence or life by the Intuitive knowledge of that Pure Happiness or Bliss. Therefore; we will utilize the next Chapter for deliberating upon the Ultimate Reality from the view-point of Pure Happiness or Bliss too.

V CHAPTER–THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF HAPPINESS

(A) Atman Alone Is Pure Happiness

138. The greatness or importance of the deliberation on Pure Happiness :

There is a greater benefit or fulfilment in considering. the Ultimate Reality from the viewpoint

Rarest Archive

of Pure Happiness or Bliss than from the viewpoints of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness. That is: Although a man may be engaged with all enthusiasm or eagerness in the consideration of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness, if at the start itself he has conceived that by that consideration finally he cannot achieve any happiness, it will be difficult to say whether he was attempting to prepare or compile the philosophical text about the Ultimate Reality or not. It is not common for people to engage themselves in many sports and recreations either through eagerness or for getting rid of boredom or weariness. But soon their getting attachment or hatred or indifference towards them is certain. If people get engaged in any work only because of eagerness or get rid of boredom, as soon as the initial enthusiasm or eagerness wears off or vanishes they get indifference developed towards it in the manner — "After all, it is this much only!" Boredom or weariness may be overcome any time. For this purpose, it will be helpful if one changes his interest or attention from one kind of work to another. Observing any new object, taking a stroll in a floral garden, playing ball games, hunting and such other recreations — if all such entertainments or hobbies are remembered, the veracity of the opinion that we have mentioned here will be comprehended by the mind. Man pursues anything keeping in his mind always the purpose that is served by it or the benefit that accrues from it Without a known or an imaginary benefit, it is not possible for the whole lot of human beings to get engaged in any work. Because the philosophical science has the purpose of finding out the Ultimate Reality alone, some people are prone to say that in philosophy

Rarest Archive

there is no need to consider any other purpose or benefit at all. But who are the qualified or fit persons for such 'purposeless' sciences? Those who say— "Being engaged in logical disputations and to keep on searching for the Ultimate Reality is itself the fulfilment of life's purepose" — may do that work; but for many people who believe that really there is a supreme goal of human existence there is no benefit whatsoever from such scientific treatises. Some people may ask — "If there is no benefit at all which can be really obtained through one's own practice, which science can at all help obtain it and from where?" But Vedanta is not mere logic or dry logic; it is the science of Intuitive experience. Even if it is determined through logic that either there may exist a certain duty which enables one to fulfil the goal of human existence or through discrimination there may be a possibility of attaining the goal of life — by that we cannot obtain any satisfaction whatsoever. "If it is keenly observed, in the case of Intuitive experience there exists a goal of human existence called 'Paramaananda' or Supreme Happiness or Bliss; That is attained only through 'Jnaana' or Intuitive experience alone; for that reason alone, the pursuit of the Ultimate Reality (Tattwa Jijnaasa) is beneficial or purposeful" — This alone is the philosophical teaching of Vedanta. Therefore, for the sake of the completion or consummate comprehension of the process of deliberation or discrimination on the Ultimate Reality as well as for its being purposeful or beneficial, deliberation on Pure Happiness or Bliss is of extreme importance and significance.

Rarest Archive

139. People's opinion regarding happiness :

In the pervious Chapters it has been established that the existence and the knowledge or consciousness that are seen in our mundane experience are our essential nature of Being alone. In the same manner, to anticipate that happiness too must be existing in our innate nature of Being alone is legitimate. Even so, just like existence and knowledge are appearing continuously, all the time, in our innate nature of Being, happiness is not appearing always. If we see any particular beautiful object, hear a pleasing sound, smell a perfumed odour, eat a tasty or savoury food, touch a soft or tender object — then only we get happiness or pleasure ; or within ourselves if we carry on a kind of lofty thinking, then also we may beget happiness. In any case, just like existence and knowledge appear all the time, happiness does not appear always but keeps on manifesting itself on the pretext or ground alone of any particular Upaadhi or adjunct, attribute. Therefore, the question — ' Does happiness really exist in our innate nature of Being, or is it a phenomenon produced by contact with external things or objects ?" — we should deliberate upon and determine.

Generally, the opinion that people entertain in this regard is : Because of our enjoyment of outer objects through our senses alone, to a large extent, happiness accrues to us. Because the enjoyment is produced in ourselves, even to say that the pleasure also is ours only' — the outer objects too must invariably be of assistance only. Depending upon the nature and

Rarest Archive

measure or quantity of the objects to be enjoyed etc. alone we believe that happiness exists in the things or enjoyment and are accumulating or amassing them. Therefore, the opinion of the common people is that by the enjoyment of outer objects alone happiness accrues. People who are discriminative and belong to higher strata of society say: Although it is true that the external adjuncts are the cause for our happiness, there is no rule or regulation at all that really the gross phenomena like sound, touch, smell etc. alone should exist. For, happiness is a special characteristic of the mental concept or thought. It is to be perceived in our daily life that the intellectual or learned persons acquire from any recreation, hobby or poetry and mental pursuit of fine arts greater happiness than the happiness that is obtained by the uncultured or unrefined people from the consumption or enjoyment of gross objects like sound, touch, smell etc. Therefore, for wise or intelligent people, despite the absence of the external object, the mind alone becomes the cause for happiness; from the outer objects or things too a little pleasure may accrue, but the Pure pleasure or happiness that is obtained from poetry, fine arts etc. cannot be gained from them — This is the opinion of some wise or intellectual persons.

148. The Witness or Saakshi alone is the Essence of Happiness :

In both these opinions stated above the opinion that happiness is a particular special characteristic of thought which is caused in our mind alone is implicit; it also becomes established that happiness is caused

Rarest Archive

by a certain adjunct alone. But does happiness lie in the adjunct (*Upaadhi*) ? Is it that from that adjunct alone happiness emerges out and manifests itself ? — It is necessary to deliberate upon these questions. For this consideration, to follow the method of examining the three states alone, which we had adopted with regard to Pure Consciousness, will be more beneficial. For, we have not undertaken the task of considering merely the fact as to how happiness accrues in the waking ; we have begun to find out the Absolute Reality of Happiness Itself. Therefore, here also the strategy or reasoning which stands on the support of comprehensive or plenary Intuitive experience alone has to be our means or instrument. Hence, let us take up for examination the states one by one. In the waking, with ragard to knowledge or consciousness of the form — "I know this object" — just as there are the divisions of the type — 'the knower', 'the means of knowledge' and the known object' (sub-section 96), in the case of enjoyment also of the form — "I enjoy this object" — the divisions of the triad of 'the enjoyer' (Bhoktru) 'the means of enjoyment (Bhoga)' and 'the enjoyed object (Bhogya)' exists. Just as we use the knowledge-oriented senses (*Jnaanendriyas*) like eyes, nose etc. to obtain knowledge, for enjoyment too some knowledge-oriented senses as well as action-oriented organs (*Karmendriyas*) we are utilizing ; just as knowledge appears in a certain form of thought or concept (*Vritti Roopa*) in the inner instrument of the mind, enjoyment too appears in a certain form of concept (*Vritti Roopa*) alone in the mind. What we have to consider now is : Does the outer object always cause the concept ? To do so which is that extra-ordinary

Rarest Archives

competence or ability existing in it? If it is true that happiness accrues from the outer object alone, then that same object should cause in everyone happiness in the same measure and quality, and it should always be causing happiness. But it is not so. If one particular object causes happiness to one person, it causes misery to another; to one person alone — although now it has given happiness, at another time from that same object misery is caused. If an object is constantly the cause for happiness alone, why does it happen in this manner? — To these questions there are no answers at all. Also to the question — "If without the outer object itself it is possible for happiness to accrue, then why does the mind desiderate an object at all?" — there is no answer available here in this context.

This knotty problem or question can be solved or untied in a particular manner. Whatever may be the object, if it is dear or lovable — we get happiness; if not, we do not get happiness. If to a particular person sweet eatables or food is desirable, to another they are not wanted even the least; to him there is a liking for substances like a dish prepared out of a particular kind of bitter vegetable alone. In this illustration the kind of happiness that accrues to the first person by consuming the sweet eatables — the same kind of happiness accrues to the other person from the bitter substance alone. To both these persons because their respective foods are dear alone, they have become things which yield happiness. Thus the statement that— 'Being dear or lovable is in itself the cause for being the means for getting happiness'

Rarest Archives

is true; out of this a truth emerges and that is — 'Because love is a quality or characteristic of the inner instrument of the mind alone, man smears the protective tin-coating of love which exists in himself alone on to the outer objects and makes them lovable or dear to himself; therefore, while saying that — 'The outer objects are the cause for happiness too' — it is evident that the love alone, which is in his heart or the inner instrument of the mind, is really the cause for his happiness. But now in our deliberation another problem or difficulty arises. That is: Why in man love with regard to a particular object and revulsion or hatred towards another object arise? If in the outer object there is no kind of happiness at all, what is the cause or reason for the mind to become fascinated by, or enamoured of, it? Apart from this, merely by the rise of any concepts or thoughts (*Vritti*) of love in the mind why should happiness accrue? In all the concepts or thoughts of the mind there does not exist happiness — why is it? In this one particular concept which gives rise to happiness what is the special feature?

141. The opinions of some people regarding the relationship of 'quality' and 'the agentship of quality' appearing in happiness :

In the previous section we have exemplified some difficulties that appear in the consideration of happiness, is it not? The fact that between these difficulties and the difficulties that we have pointed out previously (sub-sections 91, 92) with regard to Knowledge, a kind

Rarest Archive

of close comparison as well as relationship exists cannot remain without flashing to the minds of the readers. For this to happen one important cause is : The entity of 'I' alone, which is the substrate or support for the knowledge or consciousness that exists in the waking, is the substrate for happiness too. We have already (sub-section 97) mentioned that the old logicians were saying that the *phenomenon of 'I' is in its essential* nature inanimate or insentient and in it there exists a quality of knowledge or consciousness, is it not? In the same manner, they were saying that happiness too is a quality alone of *Atman* who exists in the form of 'I'. In their opinion knowledge, happiness, grief, desire, hatred, effort, righteousness and unrighteousness ... all these are qualities alone of *Atman.* Just as it is improper or unreasonable to say that to *Atman* who is insentient like a stone knowledge or consciousness is a quality, in the same way because it is unreasonable to say that happiness is a quality of *Atman* also, even with regard to this subject-matter too some present-day Vedantins are saying : Just as *Atman,* being of the essential nature of knowledge alone, is also of the nature of havingt he quality of knowledge, *Atman* being of the essential nature of happiness alone, is also of the nature endowed with the quality of happiness. But just as it is not possible to determine and state the difference between the agent possessing the quality of knowledge having the nomenclature of 'knowledge' or *Jnaana* and the quality going by the name of 'knowledge' or *Jnaana,* in the same way the mutual difference between '*Aananda*' or happiness, which is the agent possessing the quality of *Aananda* or happiness, and the quality called *Aananda* or happiness cannot be stipulated. It is clear that these people,

Rarest Archive

on the strength of *Yukti* or reasoning (logic), say that if the esssential nature of happiness itself does not exist in *Atman* or the Self who knows happiness, then to Him the knowledge of the type of — "This is happiness" — itself cannot accrue, and have given importance to the waking experience and have conceived this division or difference of 'the quality' and 'the agent possessing, or one who is endowed with, that quality'.

142. The happiness having the forms of 'the quality' and 'the agent possessing the quality' is not independent or absolute :

Let this be. Even in the case of the happiness having the forms of 'the quality' and 'the agent possessing the quality' conceived in the manner — "I am a happy person ' — if it is observed 'whether it is independent or whether the happiness that exists in it has come from another ?' — then by virtue of the strategy or reasoning that we have mentioned previously (sub-section 96) with regard to Existence it becomes evident that the root cause of this differentiation of 'the quality' and 'the agent possessing the quality' exists in the Witness or *Saakshi* who comprehends or witnesses the entire waking state. The happiness of the *Saakshi* or Witness is not a thing that has come from another source or entity ; for, It never becomes bereft of love or liking at all. If being dear or lovable alone is the hallmark of happiness, then it amounts to saying that the *Saakshi* or Witness alone is the most lovable or the dearest Entity. For example : "Every creature in the world, loving itself alone, loves the remaining things or

Rarest Archive

objects. Husband, wife, children, wealth, caste, righteonsness, political ethics (*Raaja Neeti*), physical sciences, philosophy or spiritual inquiry — all these, for whose sake are they dear or lovable? Is it not for the entity called 'I'?" — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-5-6). For whom are the objects wanted? For one's own self. Whatever is wanted for one's own people too is really for one's own sake only. All the things which become closer and closer or more and more intimate to one's self, everyone invariably loves more and more; one loves one's own self more than everything else. This fact need not be taught by anybody; this is a special feature to be found in everyone right from his birth till he is alive. Why should one love one's own self? The physical scientists say; "For one's own protection". But to the question — "Why should one protect one's own self?" — they do not have an answer. All of us have assumed that what is lovable or dear alone is the root cause for happiness, is it not? By this assumption, because the entity of 'I' is dear or lovable more than everything else, it amounts to saying that there alone (i. e. in the entity of 'I') happiness is established. If there does not exist any happiness in one's own self why is that in one's own self one has so much love? Whatever things are conceived to be "one's own" by man, he loves all those things. Because the common run of people have understood that the body alone is 'one's own self' they are ready to discard or renounce anything whatsoever for the sake of their body. But after a little discriminative thinking they come to know that more important and subtler than the body is *Praana* or the life force. If one is alive only, one can desire for

Rarest Archives

happiness, is it not? In the same way, more than *Praana* or the life force mind is still nearer or closer an *Atman* to us; *Buddhi* or discriminative power of the intellect is the innate *Atman* more than the mind. *Ahamkaara* or the ego (the 'I' notion) is the innermost *Atman*, more innate than everything else. This alone (i.e. the ego or the 'I' notion) everyone is dealing with in the form of 'I' – 'I' in the waking. This alone has been understood to be one's real essence of Being by all those who have a pronounced sense of identification with the waking. When observed from the waking viewpoint, in this phenomenon there are two kinds of characteristics. Doing such and such a thing has to be obtained or has to be avoided; such types of desire, effort and fruit having been attained, happiness or grief have to be experienced. All these together comprise one characteristic. This is being called 'Kartrutwa Bhoktrutwa' or agentship-enjoyership. The energy or capacity which prompts one to engage himself in the task of obtaining what is desirable and of avoiding what is not desirable is itself 'Kartrutwa' or agentship (doership); after having accumulated objects, the capacity or energy which enables one to enjoy them and to get either happiness or grief is itself called 'Bhoktrutwa' or enjoyership. By virtue of its having the agentship as well as the enjoyership the entity of 'I' or the 'I' notion has been allotted a higher status or place than all other things in our day-to-day dealings. As this dealing of doership and enjoyership goes on, the objects, the senses, the effort, the action, the enjoyment — all these thrive only for the sake of the entity of 'I' alone and not that they exist for their own sake. We have stated that for the entity of 'I'

Rarest Archive

alone and not that they exist for their own sake. We have stated that for the entity of 'I' agentship and enjoyership alone is the first characteristic, is it not? **'Jnaatrutwa' or knowership is the** second characteristic. What is meant by *'Jnaatrutwa'* or knowership — we have previously (sub-section 96) itself stated. It can be stated that knowership too exists in our daily transactions for the sake of agentship and enjoyership alone. For, man by virtue of his capacity of 'knowership' knows the objects through proper means of knowledge and then attempts to obtain what is wanted or desired by him and keep away things which are not wanted or desired. If that attempt succeeds or is fulfilled, he becomes happy. To keep on doing in this fashion is called **'Vyavahaara'** or **day-to-day transaction.** Hence in our workaday world transactions, knowledge is for the sake of action, action is for the sake of enjoyment; therefore, it means that *'Bhoktrutwa'* or enjoyership alone is the capacity or energy more important or higher than all other things in our daily transactions. Because of the existence of *Bhoktrutwa* or enjoyership in the entity of 'I' alone, people get elated or boosted up with the conception that life is full of happiness, thrust themselves forward, as it were, for the procurement of the objects. Why say more? There is no transaction at all without the 'I', the enjoyer! On the threshing floor of a farm land called *'Vyavahaara'* or daily transactions this enjoyership of 'I' is the threshing apparatus and around this alone each person's life in its entirety is revolving. As is conducive to this 'I' — the enjoyer, to the extent one has succeeded in procuring objects in sufficient quantity with the least fatigue or weariness and in keeping at hand

Rarest Archives

persons who are wanted by him and in keeping far away people who are not wanted— or if need be in overcoming their opposition or routing them — and has succeeded in his attempts to reduce the number of miseries and to increase the number of pleasures — he is supposed by the general public to be an adept or efficient person in his empirical dealings. 'Although people have such an abundant love for this entity of 'I', can we believe that alone. i. e. this 'I' notion alone, to be the culminating point or place for love?' If this question is posed, the answer is : From the waking viewpoint we are not able to see any entity which is greater than this 'I' notion. But as we had mentioned previously, if the comprehensive or plenary (Intuitive) viewpoint is followed, we take a firm stand in our innate or essential nature of Being of the Witness (*Saakshi*) - who observes the entire waking state itself, which comprises all the phenomena like the 'I', 'the means of enjoyment', 'the object of enjoyment'. Then the excessive or profound identification with the entity of this 'I' notion collapses or is depressed. For, just as in the empirical transactions of the waking the 'I' notion endowed with enjoyership (Bhoktrutwa) is itself the innermost 'I' more than all other phenomena, in the similar way in the comprehensive or plenary viewpoint the Witness or Saakshi is the innermost 'I' more than the entity of the 'I' notion which is the enjoyer or Bhoktru. Really, That (Saakshi) alone is the Ultimate abode of the phenomenon going by the name of 'I'. Therefore, for That Witnessing Principle or Pure Consciousness alone we have the highest love more than all other things. Hence this alone is the essential nature of the Absolute or Ultimate Reality of Happiness.

Rarest Archive

143. The essence of the entity called 'I' is itself Pure Happiness or Bliss :

What is established by the series of deliberations made so far? It is this much: All the creatures entertain an abundance of love towards the entity called 'I'; for the reason that they are of the form of — 'this is mine' — alone, the means of enjoyment and the objects of enjoyment are wanted. It is not possible at all to say that for the sake of one, person, another can enjoy. The entity of 'I' endowed with the capacity or ability of enjoyership, by subjugating everything in empirical dealings, is creating in us the delusion that it is itself the fountainhead or spring of happiness. Even so, this is not true. For, to this 'I', just as there is the relationship of happiness, there is the relationship of misery or grief too. The person who reckons in the manner — "If I exist, all else exists" — if he reckons that — "All this life is full of misery alone and that there is no solution to this at all" — then he will become ready to commit suicide itself. To the word 'I' the real meaning is: The Witnessing Principle, *Atman* or the Self of this entity or phenomenon of 'I' which is our essential nature of Being. That Witnessing Principle (Pure Consciousness) is an Entity which is never unwanted. It is not possible to shun or discard It; if observed from Its viewpoint, the earlier pronounced attachment that we entertained towards this entity or phenomenon of 'I' is decreased or is slowly defused. The happiness that existed in this phenomenon of 'I' and through that the happiness that appeared in the mental concept as well as in the objects is really this Witness alone; the fact that — "The Witness alone is the

Rarest Archive

essence of happiness" — becomes established or determined. In the Taittireeya Upanishad, after indicating five selves which are false and are projected by *Avidya* or ignorance, like *Annamaya Atma* or the self full of the food concept, *Praanamaya Atma* or the self full of life force concept, *Manomaya Atma* or the self full of the mental concept, *Vijnaanamaya Atma* or the self full of the discriminative concept, *Aanandamaya Atma* or the self full of the happiness concept — the real *Atman* who is of the essential nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss, which in truth is the essence of the empirical happiness, is taught. In that list '*Manomaya Atma* is the one who knows the outer objects; *Vijnaanamaya Atma* means the one who decides, after discrimination, and performs action; *Aanandamaya Atma*' means the enjoyer who is the innermost self when compared to all other things. It is described in this manner there. That *Aanandamaya Atma* himself we have called here — 'I' the enjoyer. In the Shruti or the scriptural text it has been stated that — "To Him love (*Priya*) itself is the head, delight or pleasure (*Moda*) is the right side and excessive elation (*Pramoda*) is the left side. Because He is dearer than all other things, love itself is His head. Through the outer objects, *Moda* (pleasures) and *Pramoda* (excessive elations), which are like stimulants, are themselves His two sides. His essence is the Witness or Saakshi who is of the nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss (*Taittireeya Upanishad* 2-5). When this is intuitively discriminated or ruminated upon, then it becomes self-evident that in the essential nature of *Saakshi* or the Witnessing Principle of Pure Consciousness there does not exist either any difference or any division.

Rarest Archives

(B) Differences In Happiness

144. The three levels of happiness :

In this Chapter the path that we had treaded or followed in the topic of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness alone will have to be followed. Having raised the same objections, we will have to state the same kind of solutions. In some circumstances in their respective deliberations there exists so much close relationship or resemblance between these two considerations that it can be safely stated that for the present deliberations it agrees if the word 'Knowledge or Consciousness' is removed and in its place the word 'Happiness or Bliss' is substituted. Therefore, we will briefly mention, by way of analysis, many considerations which we had previously stated and here we will explain only extra or special features. Readers must read once more the respective sections with the respective numbers and should contemplate upon or imagine more explanations needed in accordance with the respective circumstances. This is an indication which agrees not only with this section alone but also to all sections of this Chapter.

If the statement that -- '*Aananda* or Pure Happiness or Bliss is *Atman* alone who is without differences and is indivisible — is itself true, wherefrom did the states come or emerge ? How did the divisions of happiness and grief or misery which exist in It occur ? Because people have believed that among them there exist happiness and misery with differences, the transaction of aspiring either to help or cause harm mutually among themselves goes on, is it not ? If really no happiness whatso-

Rarest Archives

ever accrues to us at all from objects, why did the regulation evolve that when they, i.e. the objects, are there only happiness is obtained? It being so, it has to be said inevitably that in the states some kind of happiness exists, is it not? — Such doubts arising with regard to the theory or teaching of the non-dual Pure Happiness or Bliss is true. Answers to these can be given by conceiving levels or gradations in happiness too just as previously (sub-section 98) we had mentioned in the case of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness also. The Happiness of the Witness (*Saakshi*) who sees the states is **Paaramaarthika or the Absolute or Pure Happiness of Bliss.** For, It is not a thing which accrues from any other object or thing; not desiderating any time, space, causation categories and being devoid of birth and death, It is an Entity which exists as It is alone. Because the happiness which is produced on account of the objects exists only as long as their transaction lasts, it is **Vyaavahaarika Sukha or the empirical happiness.** Even from an imaginary thing for the time being happiness can accrue. For example, out of jealousy or envy to a wealthy person another person having or possessing more money will be causing misery or grief; to a lazy person doing work itself will cause misery etc. Anybody may ask: How can poverty, debt, illness or disease etc. be called happiness? But they also are means to remove the hurdles or obstructions that exist for our happiness to manifest itself. This becomes clear if the phenomenon of grief or misery is fully analysed and understood. Let this be. The happiness that accrues from this kind of illusory objects as well as from mere imagination is **Praatibhaasika Sukha or apparent (not real) happiness.** Although in the ancient texts, just as in Pure Existence

Rarest Archives

as well as Pure Consciousness the differences of the type of *Paaramaarthika* or Absolute, *Vyaavahaarika* or empirical etc. are shown, the same kind of differences being shown in the case of happiness also is not to be found, but on the strength of the same strategy or reasoning here in this context too to imagine levels or gradations in happiness is not illogical or unjustifiable.

Now then, what is meant by grief or distress? Let us consider. When people in their empirical or day-to-day transactions find greater happiness they call the *Praatibhaasika* or apparent happiness alone grief or distress. For example, if a person counteracts his grief or distress that itself he may misconceive as happiness; for this reason alone, people think that when the heavy load carried on the head is lowered, the weight having been got rid of — is itself 'happiness', as also when a disease is cured by taking medicine one thinks that he has acquired happiness. Thus even that which we are calling 'grief or distress' really belongs to the three levels or gradations of happiness that we have mentioned above and for that reason alone even if it is said that — 'Apart from happiness there does not exist any grief at all' — it is proper; in empirical transactions people are dealing with the lower level happiness itself as grief from the viewpoint of the happiness of a higher level or gradation. Therefore, if observed from the absolute viewpoint, to the philosophical truth or teaching that — 'Everything is Pure Happiness or Bliss alone' — there does not exist any harm or danger from either the differences in happiness or the divisions of happiness and grief.

Rarest Archive

145. The happiness of the workaday world also is really the Absolute or Ultimate Reality of Pure Happiness or Bliss alone:

Really if it is observed minutely, the happiness of the workaday world too is the Absolute or Pure Happiness or Bliss alone and there is no other independent happiness apart from It. Here also what strategies have been previously (sub-section 99) stated in the Chapter on Pure Consciousness the same kind of strategies or reasoning methods should be remembered and utilized. If by the performance of our actions the respective object which we wanted, or wished for, presents itself before us, the concept in our inner instrument of mind gets rid of its cover of darkness or ignorance and becomes pleased or delighted; then in it the Pure Happiness or Bliss of *Atman*, who is the *Saakshi* or Witness, manifests Itself. Because this has appeared or manifested on account of the outer object, people are thinking this to be **Vishaya Sukha or the happiness caused by the object**; further, they are also thinking that it is caused by the objects and they understand it to be a characteristic of *Atman* also (*Taittireeya Bhashya* 2-4, 2-8). But really the phenomenon of happiness is one's own essential nature of Being alone and not a characteristic or quality, nor is it an agent having that as its characteristic — this fact as well as the fact that — 'It has no birth, death etc.' — has to be reckoned or discerned in the same way as stated previously (sub-section 102) with regard to Pure Consciousness. It is true that happiness appears differently in different people; health, strength, knowledge, penance or austerity, celibacy, renunciation etc. — as all these excellences go on increasing in a

Rarest Archive

person happiness also increases. It is true that we all believe this to be a fact. But in such circumstances it should not be understood that in happiness itself there arises quantitative or qualitative differences. As stated above, one and one happiness alone through its respective concept (*Vritti*) manifests itself more and mores. That's all. For that reason alone, the scriptures are propounding: "This person alone makes the creatures happy." — (*Taittireeya Upanishad* 2-7); "Dependent upon parts (*Amsha*) of this Happiness alone all the other creatures are thriving."— (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-3-32).

146. The difference that appears in Happiness is 'Maayika' or illusory :

The 'Witnessing Pure Consciousness or Being is different, the state which is an object to It is different; within the state, 'I' and 'the rest' — such a division exists; it is seen that from different objects happiness of different measure or proportion accrues and there is a division of 'happiness' and 'grief'. In all such ways we have experiences and yet can it be said that happiness accrues without any object being there? As against the experience of the type that happiness is of three kinds — *Paaramaarthika* or Absolute, *Vyaavahaarika* or empirical, *Praatibhasika* or apparent or illusory — to say that 'Happiness is one and one only' — is it not contradictory? Although grief is being perceived by the eyes, people who argue in the fashion — 'Everything is Happiness alone' — between the opinion of such optimists or wishful thinkers and

Rarest Archives

this theory that is being propounded now does it not mean that there is a close relationship? — In this manner anybody may raise an objection.

To this objection, as has been stated previously (sub-sections 103, 104) in connection with Pure Consciousness, taking into consideration the states of dream and deep sleep a solution has to be suggested. Because the Witness is not confined to any state whatsoever, because the states cannot exist independently apart from the Witness, the fact that—"The states and the happiness that appears within those states — both are the Witness alone of the essential nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss"— becomes indubitable. Even though in the dream the happiness and grief that are caused on account of different kinds of objects and the difference in their (i. e. happiness and grief) measure or proportions are seen therein, in the dream the Triputi or triad of *Bhoktru-Bhoga-Bhogya* or the enjoyer - the means of enjoyment-the object of enjoyment is caused merely by appearance or projection. All of us have believed that there in the dream this *Triputi* or triad is really not existing at all. But even at that moment this same Witness alone is observing that apparent or false appearance of the triad. Then for all the happiness and grief that appears to us, there does not exist any cause whatsoever other than the Witnessing Pure Consciousness which is of the essential nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss. Therefore, in the waking too although the division of 'happiness' and 'grief' is appearing to us, all that is Pure Happiness alone. Because this is a decision or conclusion arrived at on the support of

Rarest Archive

Intuitive experience, it is not possible for anyone to refute it at all. The grief that the pessimist imagines too thus is really Pure Happiness alone; the optimism that — 'Everything is Pure Happiness or Bliss alone'— is itself justifiable or proper. But without showing this Intuitive experience, merely saying that — 'Everything is Happiness' — by observing from the waking view-point alone amounts to dry or perverse logic only. In the empirical world just as the difference of opinion that has arisen between the Idealists (*Vijnaanavaadins*) and the Realists (*Baahya Vastu Satyatwavaadins*) cannot be solved or mitigated, in the same manner the difference of opinion that exists between the Optimists (*Aashaavaadins*) and the Pessimists (*Niraashaavaadins*) cannot be done away with or ended by mere logic.

(C) Pure Or Absolute Happiness or Bliss

147. In deep sleep everything is Atman alone of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Happiness or Bliss :

If the experience of deep sleep is brought in to focus especially, this opinion will be further strengthened. For, there no world whatsoever exists; therefore, there the triad of 'the enjoyer', 'the means of enjoyment' and 'the object of enjoyment' or the *Triputi* of *Bhoktru-Bhoga-Bhogya* does not exist: hence, there does not exist at all any difference whatsoever in happiness. Even so, no one

Rarest Archives

can ever say that this is a state devoid of happiness. How is this? By means of reasonings which we have previously (sub-section 105) mentioned in connection with Pure Consciousness this can be discerned or Intuited. Some people may think that in deep sleep we did not have any happiness and that was merely an abence or non-existence of the grief or distress which is caused by the non-existence of the senses, i. e. the means of enjoyment; but this opinion is not proper in the least. After waking up we get a knowledge of recollection of the type — 'No grief or distress whatsoever occurred.' The opponents may ask: "Then we had happiness — such a memory is it not there at all, is it not?" The answer to that is: The fact that — "There 'we', 'happiness' — this kind of division was not there at all" — is established by universal experience, is it not? There we did not exist in the form of 'I'; neither did happiness exist as our charcteristic. It being so, how can the recollection of the type — 'I had happiness' — occur? For that reason alone, the experience of the type — 'Now I am having happiness' — does not exist at all in deep sleep. Deep sleep is Absolute or Pure Happiness devoid of particular or special features. There 'I', 'you', 'outer object', 'happiness' — none such characteristic feature exists; all of them exist in the form of featureless Absolute Happiness alone. That nature or form is our own essential nature. Therefore, the recollection of the type — 'I slept happily' — occurs in the waking. What exists therein, i. e. in deep sleep, is not mere non-existence of grief or distress, and for this truth the witness or proof or evidence is the fact that everyone of us hankers after happy sleep alone; if in deep sleep

Rarest Archive

there did not exist any happiness in a positive form, could we have prepared so well our bedrooms so that we could get sleep without any hindrance? It is enough if one compares the unlucky face of a person who by Providence did not get sleep with the serene or peaceful face of one who slept well and has got up, immediately the importance or greatness of the happiness of deep sleep becomes manifest. For the waking happiness so many conditions or stipulations are to be fulfilled. By the difference in the mind's state, monetary wealth, age, strength, the objects around we have different levels of happiness too. The happiness which we have enjoyed for a long period causes boredom; if it disappears especially we get grief or distress and agony. But look at the happiness of deep sleep: It does not have dependence on external things, nor any increase or decrease; it is always our own. Nothing else can cause hindrance to it. For, in it there is no cause whatsoever which can bring about any increase or decrease. Not knowing a second thing which is the cause for fear is itself the happiness of deep sleep. None of the phenomena like satisfaction of the mind, the happiness or pleasure from an object, elation etc., which are obtained in the waking, can ever be equal to that happiness of deep sleep. The waking happiness is *'Su-kha'*, i. e. unearthed or realized after a great deal of difficulty or effort; the happiness of deep sleep is *'Sutaraam-kha'*, meaning an entity which exists like the infinite sky devoid of any time, space, causation; an entity which is our essential nature of Being Itself. Therefore, it is proper to call it — *'Aananda'*, i. e. Pure Happiness or Bliss — a profound name indeed. Because it is such

Rarest Archives

an essential nature of Pure Bliss or *Aananda* alone, the scripture is praising deep sleep in the following manner ; "This is pure like clean water ; being of the nature of Pure Consciousness, it is one and one only without a second. This alone is *Brahma Loka* or the celestial region of *Brahman* ; this alone is his (*Jeeva's*) supreme wealth or asset ; this alone is his Supreme Bliss or *Paramaananda* ; in fact, the other creatures are thriving by enjoying small drops or bits of this *Paramaananda* or Bliss alone" — (*Brihadaaraṅyaka Upanishad* 4-3-32). If observed properly the deep sleep phenomenon is not a state at all ; it is Absolute or Pure Bliss alone. Without knowing this truth, we are looking at It from the waking viewpoint and are dealing with It as 'sleep'.

148. In the waking happiness too there does not exist any division or difference :

One should never think that in deep sleep everything 'turns into' the form of Pure Bliss and as soon as one wakes up it gets divided into 'I', 'object', 'happiness and grief'. We have previously (sub-section 84) itself mentioned that between deep sleep and waking there does not exist any cause-effect relationship whatsoever. Because we believe invariably that Pure Bliss (*Aananda*) somehow gets split up into happiness and grief in the waking, the question — "How did this bizarre or queer effect come into being ?" — gets germinated in our intellect or mind. To the doubt — "When we are asleep, why is it no felt in our experience that all happiness and grief gets dissolved and turns into Pure or Absolute Bliss

Rarest Archive

form ?" — too, this alone is the cause. The truth is not like this (sub-section 108). Pure or Absolute Bliss or Happiness alone is the Entity that exists; apart from It nothing whatsoever exists at all. But seeing It from the crooked waking viewpoint we are seeing that Pure or Absolute Bliss alone in the divided forms like 'I', 'object', 'happiness — grief'. This is the viewpoint of *'Avidya'* or ignorance. If it is to be properly observed, then one must observe from the viewpoint of our *Atman* or Self who is the Witness of the three states even. Then we come to discern or Intuit that Pure Bliss or *Aananda* never got split up at all and that in It the appearance itself of the phenomena of the three states is a delusion caused by the waking viewpoint. The wrong knowledge or misconception that happiness in the waking accrues afresh on account of the external causes is produced by our forgetting alone the truth of our essential nature of Being as the Witness.

149. Why do happinesses or pleasures appear to be many and varied ?

Whenever the objects which we have conceived in our mind to be dear or lovable come before us the dullness or turbidity of the mind flows away and the mind becomes transparent or pure; then in its thoughts or concepts (*Vrittis*) the shadow of the Pure Bliss of our essential nature of Witness is born. Just as when the waves of the ocean arise, even if the ignorant people think that there appears one moon in each of the waves, in reality, all those are merely the reflections of the

Rarest Archive

moon alone and there is no harm or threat to the truth of the oneness of the moon from the manifoldness of the reflections, in the same manner in the waves of the mind's thoughts or concepts the reflections alone, born within them, of the moon of Pure Bliss we are dealing with as 'happiness'; some Vedantins are reckoning those, i. e. reflections as happinesses or pleasures, alone to be the happinesses which are the characteristic features of *Jeevaatman* or the individual soul — (*Taittireeya Bhashya* 2-5). Just as when the wave is not there the reflection of the moon is also not there, similarly in the states like deep sleep (*Sushupti*), trance (*Samaadhi*), swoon (*Moorchha*) in which there are no mental concepts or thoughts or *Vrittis* this kind of happinesses with special features do not manifest themselves at all, and this is in our experience. For the phenomena of happinesses appearing as many, and in them divisions of the type — *Saatwika* or those endowed with the quality of *Sattwa* or goodness, *Raajasika* or those influenced by the quality of *Rajas* or passion, and *Taamasika* or those endowed with the quality of *Tamas* or darkness, dullness and ignorance — appearing (*Geeta* 18-36 to 39), and happiness appearing as opposite of *Dukha* or grief or distress — for all these there is no other cause whatsoever than these, mental thoughts or concepts or *Vrittis*. If we endeavour to find out the difference between two stipulated or specific happinesses without taking into account or discarding the adjunct of the mental concept and the object which appeared or manifested itself as the cause or *Nimitta* for the happiness, it is never possible at all to show either any division or difference in the essential or innate nature of happiness. As soon as

Rarest Archive

we discern or Intuit that — 'The modification or change of form of the thought or concept which is an adjunct can never attach itself to the innate or essential nature of Happiness with which the adjunct is mentally associated'— this fact will be completely acceptable to our mind. All of us have accepted the essential nature of Pure Bliss of *Atman* or Self, who is the Witness of the concept or thought (*Vritti*) ; when it is sufficiently possible to mention or state with the help of reasoning or argument that 'the division as well as the difference in happiness is caused by the difference in the adjuncts alone', the greater defect of imagining endless kinds of happinesses or pleasures will be shadowing all people believing in the theory of the manifoldness of happiness. Just as when a sweet drink which is prepared in a clean big vessel is filled into several small vessels smeared with different things or extraneous matter, uncleaned and made of different shapes, to decide that — 'The taste, the colour and the form or shape of the part of the sweet drink which appears in these respective smaller vessels are of the original sweet drink alone' — it cannot be proper at all, similarly we must think in the case of happiness too. For all these reasons, It is quite reasonable or justifiable to say that one and the same Absolute or Pure Bliss alone appears as endowed with the phenomena of 'quality' as also 'the object possessing quality' and 'various divisions or differences' too.

Rarest Archiver

(D) The Different Forms Of Pure Happiness Or Bliss

150. The statement about the three levels in Absolute or Pure Bliss is made from the waking viewpoint :

Now the fact that the theory of — 'Everything is *Atman's* Pure or Absolute Bliss alone' — is not contradictory to the statement — 'In happiness there are three levels' — becomes very clear. For, from the waking viewpoint we take the waking happiness as the yardstick for measurement and the happiness at a lower level than that as *Praatibhaasika,* or apparent — not real, and the happiness which we believe to be at a higher level than that as *Paaramaarthika* or Absolute or Pure in this manner we have divided happinesses. Although this division is useful for our empirical or day-to-day dealings, it is not helpful for the determination of the Ultimate Reality. When observed from the viewpoint of the Intuitive experience of the Witness (sub-section 65) which is needed for this task, everything is the one and one only Pure or Absolute Bliss of the Ultimate Reality. The forms with special features which appear only when seen from the waking viewpoint cannot really belong to the essential nature of the Entity If it belongs in that manner, then in the dark when we mistake a rope to be a snake and get startled or shrink with fear and then because when a lamp is brought we do not see the snake — there we will have to believe that — 'Really the rope had become a snake and when the lamp was brought, it, i. e. the snake, again entered into the rope (where it belonged)'.

Rarest Archive

151. The phenomena of being with special features and being devoid of special features etc. seen in Pure Bliss is also due to the waking viewpoint alone:

There is a great difference between the Pure Bliss of deep sleep and the happinesses or pleasures of the waking. In deep sleep there exists Pure Bliss devoid of any division or difference whatsoever; but in the waking there is happiness in which appear the divisions of 'quality' and 'the entity posseseing that quality', 'birth and death', 'the differences caused by the substrate and the object.' The waking happiness exists differently in each individual and exists in different measures in different human societies. Can these two with such opposite qualities or characteristics be said to be of one and the same species of Pure Bliss? Now it must be clear to the readers that it is possible to find out a satisfactory solution to this objection in the same manner as stated before (sub-section 108) in connection with Pure Consciousness. When it is known on the strength of the comprehensive Intuitive experience of the three states that — 'One and the same Absolute or Pure Bliss exists in all forms' — the argument or logic that is put forth on the basis of the parochial waking viewpoint cannot attain any value whatsoever. All the happinesses or pleasures of the waking are caused by the differences in the adjuncts. These adjuncts too are visible to the *Avidya Drishti* or viewpoint of ignorance of the waking alone and really they (i. e. the adjuncts) do not have any independent existence whatsoever. From the Absolute point of view they too exist as the essential nature of Pure Bliss alone. Just as the water of the ocean being as it is on the top becoming an iceburg, it floats on

Rarest Archiver

itself, in the same manner on the top of the ocean of Absolute or Pure Bliss it is appearing to the waking mind's eye as if this Happiness Itself with these 'apparent' adjuncts and such other differences is floating and moving like an iceberg. Even then everything is that very ambrosial ocean of Pure Bliss alone.

(E) The Divisions Of Happiness And Grief

152. It is not proper to say that there exists a division in happiness :

The same answer is sufficient for the question — "Even though everything is Absolute or Pure Bliss alone devoid of special characteristics, why do the divisions of 'happiness' and 'grief' occur ?" For, when observed from the Absolute viewpoint of the Ultimate Reality the one and only Pure Bliss without a second exists. In It there is no number. Apart from It there does not exist at all either any state or any divisions of 'happiness' and 'grief'. In the states different people being imagined or conceived and then imagining among them different kinds of happinesses and griefs are caused — all this is the result or outcome of the waking viewpoint. More explanations required for this truth may be known by referring to the objections and the satisfactory answers that were given previously (sub-section 67) in connection with Pure Existence.

Rarest Archive

153. The difficulties or anomalies that appear in the waking regarding happiness:

There is yet another device or strategy (sub-section 112) to say that there is no contradiction or opposition between the phenomenon of the appearance in our waking of the divisions among the happinesses or pleasures, the divisions of happiness and grief and the divisions of the quality of happiness and the agent or person possessing this quality of happiness, on the one hand, and the philosophical teaching or *Siddhaanta* that — 'There exists one and only Absolute or Pure Bliss alone'. That is: To determine the essential nature of the happiness that appears to us in the waking, our waking intellect or mind is not capable or qualified at all. What is happiness? Do different kinds of happinesses accrue to us from different kinds of objects? If so, what is the difference in their innate or essential natures? If it is said that there exists a certain difference in the essential natures, then that amounts to being something other than happiness and will have to be grief alone. But will the statement that the special feauture or characteristic of happiness is grief or distress be acceptable to or palatable to the intellect or mind? If this difference is not produced from the essential nature itself of happiness, then it must be caused by another adjunct or *Upaadhi*. Which is that adjunct? Is it an object or is it the substrate of *Jeevaatman* or the individual soul?

The essential nature itself of an object is not possible to be determined in the manner — "It is such and such" (sub-section 69); it being so, is it possible

Rarest Archive

to know on the basis of that indeterminable object as to how either the division or the difference in happiness is produced? Further, the essential nature also of the *Jeeva* or individual soul, who is the substrate, is similar. Because on different occasions each one of these following, viz. the body, the vital force or *Praana*, the mind, the intellect, the ego, we deal with them as I', really does an individual soul or *Jeeva* exist or not? It is true that with regard to the phenomenon — 'I exist' — there is no scope for any doubt whatsoever to arise; but if it is deliberated upon, to the question as to — "Which is my essential nature?" — many doubts arise and trouble us. When the plight of the essential nature of the 'I', which is directly or Intuitively known, is like this, what can be said with regard to the other *Jeevas* or souls whom 'I' has to imagine and know? Anyhow, from the waking viewpoint the essential nature of *Jeeva* or the individual soul, who is the substrate for empirical happinesses or pleasures, cannot possibly be determined. Therefore it is not possible to determine as to what is happiness or the divisions that exist in it. Even so, the waking intellect or mind is saying as though the essential nature of happiness etc. is determined. By this reasoning it becomes established that all this is *Maayika* or illusory.

154. The divisions of happiness and grief too are Maayika or illusory alone :

Now let us consider a little the object on "Can grief also be said to be happiness alone?" Here also

Rarest Archive

all the strategies which have been mentioned above will be convenient and helpful to us. For, when observed from the waking viewpoint, if questions like — "What is meant by grief ?" "Is there any increase or decrease, any division or any difference in grief ?" — are put, here too the intellect or mind takes to silence alone. There is no doubt about the fact that the symptomatic division of the type — 'What appears to be convenient is happiness ; what appears to be inconvinient or hazardous is grief' — is beneficial to the day-to-day transactions. But the divisions of east and west directions is also of that much benefit only, is it not ? Rama's farm is to the east of Bheema's farm, to the west of Kaama's farm ; the farm is itself — is it in the east or in the west ? — if such a question is put, what is the answer ? The division of east and west is relative; that means a thing is to be determined by comparing it with another alone, and independently there is nothing like east and west at all in the absolute sense — In this manner an answer will have to be given, is it not ? Similarly, the empirical transactional division of the type — 'Compared to a thing that is convenient or beneficial, the thing that is inconvenient should be called grief' — is to that extent proper. But does grief exist independently, in and by itself ? What is its essential nature ? Does it exist really apart from happiness ? — This is the crux of the problem now. Here our intellect or mind becomes still, silent ! For, what is pleasurable to one person is grievous to another; what is pleasurable at a particular time to one person, at another time that same thing becomes the source of grief. Because to many people the defect in the symptom of the type — 'What appears to be grief

Rarest Archive

alone is grief' — is likely to be self-evident, that problem we will not elaborate upon too much here. For, who are these 'many people'? How many people? Who has to reckon them and how, and then gather them together? After gathering them all together, how to determine what appears to be distressful or miserable to them? If it is to be determined from their statements alone, then what about those statements which do not have the support of our own experience; in that case will that be sufficient to determine the essential or innate reality of grief?— Such questions will come up before us one behind the other and confront us. Therefore, the phenomenon of the divisions of happiness and grief too is a thing appearing to the waking viewpoint in its 'indiscreet or unwary' state alone and not an absolutely real entity; thus it becomes established that 'all that is *Maayika* or illusory alone'.

155. The Absolute or Pure Bliss that is common to waking and dream is one and the same:

By comparing waking and dream, much more strength is acquired by the present deliberation or consideration. That can be done in the following manner: In the dream too, just as in the waking, it appears as though there exist divisions in happiness, as also the divisions of 'happiness' and 'grief'. Although later on the phenomenon of dream appears as a delusion, at that moment it appears to be true just as the waking alone, and therefore, it is not possible to determine that 'such and such a state alone is the real waking' These facts we have mentioned in connection with Pure Existence (sub-sections 71-81) and Pure Conscious-

Rarest Archives

ness (sub-sections 114-119). If those devices only are adopted here also and observed, it becomes clear that for both waking and dream one and the same Pure Bliss is common. To wit, none of the objects seen in the dream, nor the pleasures accruing from them, nor the 'I' which was the substrate for those pleasures exists now. There is no support whatsoever to say that the object, the pleasure and the enjoyer, which exist now — were existing there (in the dream). Thus although no part of a state whatsoever exists in another state, now the 'memory' of the type — 'In the dream I experienced happiness' — is occurring; now we have got the knowledge from recollection to the effect that then (in the dream) really we had happiness. Between the knowledge by recollection of the happiness experienced in the waking yesterday and this knowledge — there does not exist any difference whatsoever. If the previous condition in which there was experience of happiness is brought to mind, it is not possible to show any difference whatsoever in the experience of happiness. Here in the previous waking state there is at least a scope for us to believe that these very things existed; therefore, there, i. e, in the waking, it may even be said that happiness accrued from the adjuncts of the objects. But in the dream there is no scope to say so ! How should the experience of happiness there, i. e. in the dream, be substantiated or proved ? It is easy to refute the whole of the dream as being false, but it is not so easy to say that the 'experience of the dream' itself was false ; in the present context, especially, the question — 'Although the dream was false only, there without any adjunct or any object being there how did the experience of the happiness accrue ?' — will remain firmly unanswered

Rarest Archives

For this, one answer alone will be capable of giving satisfaction, and that is: The Witness or *Saakshi* is of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Bliss. In It, although the appearance of the experience of happiness accruing in accordance with the object is illusory, the Pure Bliss especially cannot be false; because It is common to both the states, the memory of the type — 'In the dream I enjoyed happiness' — has been produced. Barring the Witness if all else is illusory, then there is no cause for the memory of all these, viz. the previous time, the previous state and the object that existed in it! For this doubt, a satisfactory answer has to be found out by that device or strategy alone which was stated or utilized during consideration of Pure Consciousness (sub-section 121).

156 The happiness and grief that appear in waking and dream are not caused one by the other:

Here in this context too it will be good to keep in mind that -- 'Because the dream also during its time seems to be waking alone — just like the waking, to think that it (i. e. the dream) is false is merely the predilection of the waking viewpoint alone and not a significance of taking the viewpoint of Reality. There is no rule or regulation that the happiness or the grief which we experienced in the waking alone comes in the dream; there is no rule or regulation that the dream happiness or grief comes in the waking. To the one who had eaten a feast bellyful in the waking it may become agonizing in the dream as if he had starved for many days. In the waking one who has been put in a cell handcuffed may in his dream become an

Rarest Archive

emperor and, having taken thousands of brave men captives in a war, he may rejoice. The waking scholar may be a dream dullhead, the person gifted with the power of retaining in his memory hundreds of things here in the waking may not even remember, there in the dream, as to how much is three plus four. Just as the essential natures of the objects in these two states may change, just as their knowledges may change into ones with extremely opposite natures, similarly for the pleasures or happinesses and griefs too to appear in an extremely and mutually opposite manner in their respective states — there is no hindrance at all. We have previously (sub-sections 77-78) stated elaborately how there is no support whatsoever to believe that one state is the cause for the other. Therefore, what is deduced? The dream happinesses and griefs are not in the least inferior in their character to the waking happinesses and griefs. It is true that now in the waking no one ventures to experience the dream happiness or to mitigate the dream grief; so what? In that state, i.e. dream state, we were struggling with the same interest or zeal to acquire happiness and to prevent grief — this fact is established on the strength of experience. Therefore, here what we have to understand is this much: The waking enjoyer, the means of enjoyment and the objects of enjoyment, the mind that observes the objects — all these do not exist apart from the Witness who observed the waking; the dream enjoyer, the means of enjoyment and the objects of enjoyment, the mind which sees those objects — all these do not exist apart from the Witness who observes the dream — (*Maandukya Kaarika* 4-64, 66). All these are really in their essential or innate nature mere appearances; they are not caused

Rarest Archive

one by the other. All this is from the essential nature of the Witness or Pure Bliss alone; in that nature no grief whatsoever has ever appeared at all.

(F) The Essential Nature Of Pure Bliss

157. The Pure Bliss that exists in deep sleep :

Now it can be seen as to what the ultimate result of the series of considerations that we have made so far is. Just as in the case of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness, here also to determine the issue the deep sleep alone is the important means for us. When we are observing from the Pure Bliss viewpoint, there is a greater possibility of our misconceiving deep sleep. For, it is our belief that deep sleep is a 'state of void' alone, devoid of either happiness or grief. But because there — as in the case of the waking — there is no possibility at all of any happiness or grief from an object being caused or gained, to say that — 'Therein, i.e. in deep sleep, neither happiness nor grief exists' — amounts to the rejection of some thing which can never be obtained (*Apraapta Nishedha*)— just like saying : "The stone does not have happiness". Apart from this, we are making this statement without even knowing what the cause is for saying that — 'There in deep sleep neither happiness nor grief exists'. Because there is no possibility of any happiness accruing to a stone, there is no happiness for a stone; because there is no need at all of any happiness accruing to our *Atman* or Self, there is no happiness in deep sleep. Although from the waking viewpoint we

Rarest Archive

can say — 'There in deep sleep we do not have happiness' — because in the waking we believe that we do have happiness, in deep sleep we do not exist in the form of 'I' at all. We exist in our essential nature of Pure Happiness or Absolute Bliss alone. To the Absolute or Pure Happiness or Bliss wherefrom and why should happiness accrue once again? In the waking what we are calling — 'happiness' — is nothing but a concept or thought having a reflection or an image of Pure Happiness or Bliss; it can exist only when the inner instrument of the mind exists. It cannot at all exist without there being an object. In deep sleep the concept also has become Pure Happiness alone; the object too has become Pure Happiness alone. Therefore, in deep sleep although the statement that — 'We do not have happiness' — is true, there in deep sleep we, i. e. our 'I' notion, mind, happiness, object — all these have become Pure Happiness alone. Here (in deep sleep) '*Atman*, being Blissful, is enjoying Pure Bliss' — thus the scriptural or *Shruti* statement (*Maandukya Upanishad* 5) has this alone as its essential purport. In the waking as well as in the dream, happiness has to accrue to us afresh; in deep sleep it is not so. We ourselves are of the essential nature of Pure Happiness or Bliss. There the enjoyer (*Bhoktru*), the means of enjoyment (*Bhoga*) and the object of enjoyment (*Bhogya*) — all have become one alone. Therefore, this can be called — **Shuddha Aananda or Pure Bliss.**

158. Deep sleep is not of the nature of the absence of grief :

Although it is true that there is no grief in deep

Rarest Archive

sleep, it is not a state of the nature of non-existence. Our *Atman* alone exists therein. It is wrong to think that there we observe our *Atman* in the form of non-existence of grief, non-existence of happiness, non-existence of object, non-existence of the 'I' notion etc. For, existence (*Bhaava*) and non-existence (*Abhaava*) — both are phenomena concerning an object. *Atman* is a Witness who is an eternal subject who observes non-existence too just as He observes existence. Apart from this, non-existence is a phenomenon known only through its counterpart; for example, unless there exists the knowledge as to what is an earthen-pot, there is no meaning at all to a statement about — 'Non-existence of an earthen pot'. Therefore, where there is a possibility of the knowledge of an earthen pot, there alone the knowledge of the non-existence of the earthen pot is possible. In deep sleep there is no possibility of any existence or its knowledge accruing; therefore, there is no scope there in deep sleep either for any non-existence or for its knowledge. Hence for our beliefs that deep sleep is a 'non-existence of grief' etc. it is established that the waking grief etc. alone are the counterparts. Therefore all that we believe that deep sleep is of the nature of non-existence is from the waking viewpoint alone. If it is observed from the viewpoint of the experience of the deep sleep, *Atman* alone who has transcended the divisions or distinctions of existence and non-existence exists there in the essential nature of Pure Bliss. This Pure Bliss alone which is beyond existence and non-existence is the Ultimate Reality that is to be known by Vedanta (*Naishkarmya Siddhi* 3-113). Not only this. Deep sleep means our essential nature of Pure Bliss. Without knowing this our essential nature, we

Rarest Archive

are calling It alone 'deep sleep'. The reason for our recollection of this essential nature as a past event in the manner — "I slept happily" — should be understood as mentioned in the Chapter on Pure Consciousness (sub-section 127). If it is stated — "We were in deep sleep" — it means — "We were in our essential nature of Pure Bliss" — alone. Because the essential nature of an entity can never change, we are even now existing in that essential nature of Pure Bliss alone. Because we had merged, or become one with, this essential nature of Pure Bliss alone, when we wake up our body becomes light, our mind becomes clear or transparent, imbued with liveliness or vivacity; the intellect is capable of deciding or determining a topic or problem and deciding a line of action; everywhere the world seems to us to be full of happiness alone.

159. Waking and dream too are different forms of Pure Bliss alone :

Because in deep sleep, as stated above, the three phenomena of 'happiness', 'one who experiences happiness' and 'the object of happiness" — all of them have become one, it is possible for us to observe the whole world to be full of happiness or bliss. The reason for us to see the beauty, the splendour and greatness that exist in the world and rejoice with bliss or happiness is the fact — "That world too is a different form of our essential nature of Pure Bliss or Happiness alone". Why say more ? Waking and dream — both these are the big waves which have swelled up and risen from that ocean of Pure Bliss. The foam,

Rarest Archives

bubbles and drops that are variously seen in those waves are all that ambrosia of Pure Bliss alone. Here in this waking world the other souls that are seen are also our essential nature of Pure Bliss alone ; when this truth is known or cognized, in us friendship and affection towards them are produced. When we do not know this fact, hatred and enmity are caused. So what ? Just as friendship, love and pleasure etc. too are parts of that ocean of Pure Bliss, similarly hatred, enmity etc. too are its parts only. Merely because the foam is dirty, will it cease to be water. Because of names and forms, Pure Love (*Prema*) too acquires the forms of discontentment and fear ; and even those are, in reality, Pure Bliss alone putting on different garbs. If we desire that all these should appear to us as they are in the form of Pure Bliss alone, then we should shun the addiction to, or craze for, seeing them through the magnifying lens of waking and observe them with the viewpoint of the essential nature of the subtle Intuitive experience. Then it will be fully reckoned that apart from our Pure Bliss there does not exist anything whatsoever.

160. The statement that Pure Bliss does not exist at all is dry logic :

To the argument with an objection — "We have not seen at all anywhere Pure Bliss, which means happiness which is devoid of — objects, increase and decrease, birth, growth and death, blending or mixing with grief, support and the objects supported ! " — a reconciliation has to be obtained by the satisfactory answer that has been mentioned

Rarest Archives

previously (sub-section 129) in connection with Pure Consciousness alone. We are always (eternally) of the innate nature of Pure Bliss alone, and it is not possible at all to observe It as an object. For the fact that we existed in deep sleep in that form or nature of Pure Bliss, our Intuitive experience alone is the witness; and for that nature to be existing even now in the essential nature of the Witness (*Saakshi*) or Pure Consciousness or Bliss, our Intuitive experience alone is the witness or proof. Even when It exists in the forms of 'the Witness', i. e. Pure Consciousness as the Self or *Atman*, and 'the witnessed', i. e. the ego and its paraphernalia, because they exist without the divisions of time-space-causation concepts It is nothing but Pure Bliss alone. Because the Witness or the Self is the Witness of time space and causation themselves, It is devoid of the divisions of time, space and causation too. Because the time-space-causation complex is itself subsumed in the 'witnessed' category alone, apart from, or beyond, the generality of the witnessed category in 'the form of the witnessed' no time, space, causation complex exists at all. Thus the witnessed category too is not affected by the time-space–causation divisions. Therefore, even when Pure Blise exists in the forms of 'the Witness' and 'the witnessed', It exists devoid of any divisions or distinctions alone. It should be understood that just as the Intuitive experience of Pure Consciousness exists without any distinctive features or varieties (*Nirvikalpa*), in the same manner this Pure Bliss too exists without distinctive features alone. Because It does not have any divisions of time, space and causation, this Pure Bliss is neither with change, nor without change (sub-section 130); even the

Rarest Archives

phenomenon that this Pure Bliss appears in the forms of the waking and the dream also is an illusory form or an unreal appearance (*Vivarta*) alone and not entities existing by themselves apart from Pure Bliss. This truth should always be kept in mind. Then there is no scope for the objection based on dry logic of the type — "How were the states and the happiness and grief that exist in them born or caused from the changeless Pure Bliss ? " — to rise at all.

161. Although Pure Bliss is eternally our essential nature, there is a benefit accruing from the deliberation based on the scriptures :

If we always exist in the essential nature of Pure Bliss alone, why should there be any deliberation on the Ultimate Reality at all ? What we want is Pure Bliss or Happiness ; that, as you say, is ever and eternally secured only. It being so, why should the scriptural texts be written or composed ? Why should they be read at all ? — Thus any one may ask. This too is the result of not deliberating properly. For, though we are of the essential nature of non-dual, eternal Pure Bliss, without knowing or realizing this fact we are seeing from the waking viewpoint alone and are taking it that we are mutable and are of the innate nature of grief, and from that misconception we are feeling distressed. Therefore, if this calamity caused by this m sconception is to be got rid of, then the right knowledge alone is required. Even though there are hundreds of rupees in a box belonging to a person, if he does not know that in his box there is money -- then what benefit he

Rarest Archive

could get from that money cannot accrue to him. In a train to a person who is yelling out of delusion that he has lost his ticket, if he were to get rid of that grief then the knowledge that the ticket exists in his pocket alone is needed by him Similarly, although we are really *Atman* or the Self alone of the essential nature of non-dual Pure Bliss, as long as we have taken ourselves to be mutable or distinctive and grief-stricken, despite the fact that that essential nature of Pure Bliss exists in us only It is of no avail at all; the grief that is caused by misconception is tormenting us invariably. If a rational scripture as well as a preceptor — both of which can provide the right knowledge that can remove this misconception — show us the path of right deliberation and teach us the method of observing in accordance with our Intuitive experience, though Pure Bliss is our essential nature alone it will appear as if It has been acquired by us afresh. Therefore, after the goal of our pursuit is known (i. e. *Atman* of the essential nature of Pure Bliss is cognized) even if the scriptural text becomes futile, it is not to be regretted; for those who have not known the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* there is essentially a purpose or benefit accruing from the scripture. If it is contended in the manner — "Knowing also is futile only, is it not?" — it is not so. For, it is seen in our experience that there is the benefit of the nature of the misconception being removed by proper or right knowledge. To argue in the manner — "It is not possible to remove misconception" — is contradictory to what we have seen in our experience. When it is being seen that misconception is removed by Intuitive knowledge of the non-dual Pure Bliss, the statement of people who assert — quite contrary to

Rarest Archives

this — in the manner — "Right knowledge is futile" — is not believed by anyone. To say that what is seen is not at all reasonable is itself not proper or justifiable. For, what is seen is a fact, i. e. it is in experience. If it is argued that the fact that it is seen also is not reasonable, then for that argument too the same strategy or dialectic reasoning should be made applicable (*Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya* 1-4-10). For, after a particular phenomenon is seen, to reason out that —'It should not have been seen' — itself becomes faulty or wrong deliberation. It smacks of a lack of proper discrimination.

162. We can know, i. e. Intuit, Pure Bliss which is our essential nature :

Because Pure Bliss is our essential nature alone, to know It that essential nature itself will have to be objectified, is it not ? How is this possible ? — This kind of an objection is also raised. To that a solution can be stated, just as an answer had been given previously (sub-section 135) to the same kind of objection raised in connection with Pure Consciousness. For, as Pure Bliss is a concept which we have formed from the experience of deep sleep in our day-to-day transactions, in order to know or objectify Pure Bliss we will have to imagine our essential nature that existed in deep sleep. Then, our present waking knowledge or consciousness will have to cut itself asunder or it has to get lost or obviated; immediately our individuality as well as knowledge or consciousness will get submerged in that essential nature Itself; we ourselves become Pure Bliss alone —

Rarest Archives

devoid of the divisions or distinctions of 'subject' and 'object'. Thus because one who knows Pure Bliss becomes Pure Bliss Itself, thereafter once again there is neither any cause left or will remain behind to know that concept or feeling of 'subject' and 'object' nor our essential nature of Pure Bliss will get transformed into an object. "There is no cause or reason for one who knows the Pure Bliss or *Brahman* to be afraid of anything whatsoever" -- (*Taittireeya Upanishad* 2-9). For, because one is the endless *Brahman* alone there does not exist at all anything else apart from oneself. "If there is a second thing only, one will have to be afraid of it — is it not?"— (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 1-4-2)

VI CHAPTER – CONCLUSIONS

(A) The Gist Of What Has Been Stated So Far

63. The Intuitive vision of Satchidaananda or Pure Existence - Pure Consciousness - Pure Bliss :

So far we have deliberated taking recourse to three viewpoints, viz. the Pure Existence viewpoint, the Pure Consciousness viewpoint and the Pure Bliss viewpoint, in order to find out the Ultimate Reality. Just like three participants in an event stating their respective stories or accounts, Existence, Consciousness and Happiness — these three phenomena which

Rarest Archive

we see in the empirical world have presented their respective stories or accounts in front of the judge, i. e. experience. Because here the account of one is similar to the accounts of the others, after reading one's statement the other two statements appeared to us to be 'echoes' of the first. In the end when examined it was declared that existence, consciousness or knowledge and happiness — all these phenomena are one and the same Ultimate Reality and that Ultimate Reality alone is appearing to us here in three ways, putting on different garbs. Therefore, the philosophical truth or teaching of this declaration may be called *"Satchidaananda Darshana"* or "the philosophy of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness and Pure Bliss."

164. The opinion of Vedantins

There exists a doubt among some aspirants with regard to the teaching — "There exists an Ultimate Reality". There is an opinion of 'some people' that what appears to us — that alone is the Ultimate Reality for us and apart from that there is no Ultimate Reality. It is the opinion of some others that it is impossible for man, who exists or lives in one part of the world for some period of time only and then dies, to know by means of his little intellect or mind the Ultimate Reality ; some others opine that because the world that appears is flowing like a river of change continuously without a break, in it apart from change there does not exist any Ultimate Reality at all. The Vedantins have determined that these two opinions too are not proper and that although the

Rarest Archives

world that appears before us is of a nature of change alone, there exists an Ultimate Reality which is beyond change and man can find That Entity or Truth out. The philosophical Truth that Vedantins talk about is to be found elucidated in the *Upanishads*. Although in the *Upanishads* there exists a consideration of rituals as well as meditations, what is predominantly taught in the *Upanishads* is the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality or *Brahman* alone. Because *Jnaana* or Intuition (knowledge) means the proper knowledge alone, the knowledge that is in keeping with Intuitive experience alone has been taught in the *Upanishads* in an aphoristic form. The statements of these *Upanishads* need not at all be believed because of the reason that they are sentences of the *Upanishads* alone; it is the opinion of the Vedantins that everyone can deliberate upon the Ultimate Reality in the manner taught in the *Upanishads* and find out Intuitively the Ultimate Reality.

165. The method of the examination of the three states that Vedantins utilize :

For the deliberation on the Ultimate Reality in the philosophical school of Vedanta a certain extra-ordinary method is taught. After examining the three states, finding out the Intuitive experience by means of reasoning or ratiocination and deciding It alone is that method. In the world because all the others reckon the waking alone as important and see the other remaining states from the waking viewpoint, theirs is an incomplete (partial or parochial) viewpoint. Because Vedantins alone examine with an unbiased outlook the three states which are perceptible to Intuitive experience,

Rarest Archive

compare each with the other state, discard the worthless by means of reasoning and find out as to what is the Ultimate Reality of the whole gamut of experiences — theirs is a paramount philosophical teaching born on the strength of a comprehensive outlook or viewpoint. In order to realize that that philosophical teaching or truth is one that can never be falsified in any period of time, the means or the expedient is to attain that Ultimate Reality of Vedanta, which is beyond time, in one's Intuitive experience alone. The protagonists of the other schools of philosophy too are stating that they are also utilizing experience and reasoning. But by experience what they mean is of the waking; the reasoning too is of the waking alone. Therefore, what experience they refer to is incomplete and their reasoning is non-pervasive. What the Vedantins adopt or follow — that complete or comprehensive Intuitive experience and pervasive reasoning — they are more powerful than those adopted by the other schools of philosophy. Without realizing as to what is meant by a state there are people who deliberate upon the three states. But by their method the non-dual Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or the Self is not established. For, they are considering the essential natures of *Atmans* or selves which are distinct by virtue of their respective bodies (*Maandukya Bhashya* 3).

166. The essence of Vedantic philosophy :

The essence of Vedantic philosophy is implied in one verse

Rarest Archive

Brahma Satyam Jagan Mithyaa Jeevo Brahmaiva Naaparaha
Jeevanmuktastu Tadvidwaaniti Vedaantadindimaha

Meaning ; "*Brahman* is the Reality, the world is a delusion, *Jeeva* or the soul is *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality alone and not anything else ; one who has known this is a *Jeevanmukta* or an enlightened or emancipated one while in this body itself — Thus the drum of Vedanta Philosophy is proclaiming." To wit, there is an Ultimate Reality which is eternally true (Satyam), Pure Consciousness or Knowledge (*Jnaanam*), Pure Bliss, or Happiness (*Aanandam*). This Ultimate Reality is called "**Brahman**". The word *Brahman* means greater or bigger than all other things, an Entity beyond the limitations or restrictions of time, space, causation categories. There is another name, **Bhooma**, for this Entity. *Bhooma* also means super-abundance of greatness alone. Wherein nothing else is seen, nothing else is heard, nothing else is known, That alone is *Bhooma* (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 7-22 1). This has yet another name — **Akshara**. *Akshara* means indestructible. It has no changes like birth, growth, withering or emaciation, wearing out, destruction. Therefore, It has the name of '**Sat**' or that which really exists. **Purusha** is one more name for It ; because It exists *in toto* or completely everywhere, It has been given this name. Because *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality pervades all distinctions or divisions like time, space, states of consciousness etc. and Itself shines in their forms also, to *Brahman* the name of '*Purusha*' suits in all respects too. The other *Purushas* (*Jeevas*) are not *Purushas* in the true sense ; if they, i. e. the souls or *Jeevas*, are called *Purushas*, then this

Rarest Archive

Brahman will have to be called **Purushottama.** It has also the nomenclature of **'Atman'.** *Atman* means the essential nature or core of Being. Whatever moving or immobile creatures there are in the world, whatever inert or insentient things exist in this world — for all those things this *Brahman* alone is **Atman** or the essential nature of Being. In all these names one opinion or purport is implicit ; that is — *Brahman* is **Ananta** or endless, eternal. There are no time, space, things devoid of It. Apart from It a second entity does not exist at all. So much meaning is implicit in the sentence — *"Brahma Satyam"* or *"Brahman,* the Ultimate Reality, is *Satyam* or the eternal or Absolute Truth or Reality."

If *Brahman* alone is true, where does the world come into the picture ? Where do the souls or *Jeevas* come into the picture ? In other words, neither the world nor the *Jeevas* or souls can be taken into the reckoning at all is it not ? In front of us there is a world comprising various kinds of creatures, things. This world further comprises time, space and causation complex too ; in this world souls or *Jeevas,* endowed with different levels of knowledge or intelligence, and with different mental make-ups or temperaments are performing different kinds of actions and are experiencing or enjoying various kinds of fruits or results according to their actions. How did all this come about ? When these kinds of multifarious things exist, how can it be said that *'Brahman* alone is the Reality ? ' — Thus the common people may get a doubt. To get rid of this doubt, one should undertake the examination of the

Rarest Archives

three states of consciousness. In the waking alone this world appears to us ; but this does not exist in our dream. It keeps on appearing as if in each dream there exists a different world altogether. The world that exists in the waking does not exist in any dream whatsoever ; that means 'I', 'others', the moving and immobile creatures, inert or insentient things, the earth and the sky — all these are different. Not a single part of the waking world appears in the dream. Even we attain a different form therein in the dream with different adjuncts like the body, the life force or *Praana*, the mind, the senses etc. Just as a worm gets transformed into a butterfly, we cannot say that because of some different cause therein, i.e. in the dream, we attain a transformation. It is also not possible to think that just as a man becomes a woman as a result of a curse, there in the dream we obtain a different physical form; for, without any relationship whatsoever with the waking time and space a new-found world with a time-space-causation complex of its own appears there in the dream. Thus because in the dream the waking world does not exist at all, because in the deep sleep neither the waking and the dream states nor their respective worlds exist at all, it becomes evident that apart from the states or devoid of the states a separate world does not exist at all; what is called 'the world' or the phenomenon of the world is nothing but an appearance that is seen or observed within a state alone. Because our essential nature of Being, which is the Witness that observes this appearance, exists in all the three states, this our essential nature of Being, the Witness or *Saakshi*, is nothing but the immutable *Brahman* alone which appears in the forms of the states, comprising time, space, causation

Rarest Archive

categories. Because the world is merely an appearance that is seen for the time being, in that particular form it is not absolutely real like *Brahman*, and hence it is *Mithya* or an illusion; or better than saying that it is illusory, it can be stated that it also is real in the form of *Brahman* alone. **Whether it is said that the world is illusory or that it is real in the form of Brahman alone — both mean the same.**

In front of us many souls are appearing. They perform various kinds of acts, and in accordance with the time-space-causation regulations they are experiencing the fruits of their actions, is it not? To this doubt also now an answer has been found and this fact becomes evident. For, the souls appear to be many because of the adjuncts like the body, the senses, the life force, the mind, the intellect, the ego etc. These adjuncts are seen or they appear only in our waking. In the dream they do not appear; in the deep sleep especially, everything has merged in one and the same essential nature of Being, devoid of any adjunct whatsoever. Therefore, the statement — "Various types of souls or persons exist" — is made from the waking viewpoint alone. If it is observed from the comprehensive viewpoint of the three states, one and one *Atman* alone exists. Nothing whatsoever, second to or apart from Him, i.e. *Atman* or the Self, exists at all. To the sentence — "*Jeeva* is *Brahman* alone" — this alone is the meaning.

Knowing in the manner — "Like the other souls or *Jeevas*, I am also a *Jeeva*" — is also done

Rarest Archive

from the waking viewpoint alone. But when we know or understand in the manner -- "*Jeevas* are many" — what is the meaning we attach to the word '*Jeeva*'? If *Jeeva* means 'I', then 'I' cannot be many. The 'I' notion is not an object too. If for the word 'I' the meaning of 'I' notion (*Ahampratyayi*) is given up and the meaning of 'subject' (*Vishayi*) is attached, even then 'subject' cannot be many; that which objectifies all else, that alone is the subject. Such a thing is one and one only. Further, if for the word 'I' the meaning of 'Witness' is attributed especially, then the Witness is never many and Its manifoldness cannot even be imagined. Anyway, the phenomenon of 'many *Jeevas* or souls' is merely a notion or concept that people have formed in their day-to-day transactions (*Vyavahaara*) alone, and there does not exist any experience which can establish the manifoldness of *Jeevas* or souls, nor does any device or strategy whatsoever exist to do so. Not only this; this phenomenon of *Jeevatwa* or soulhood itself does not at all withstand the onslaughts of reasoning (logic) and experience. For instance, we keep saying -- "The 'I' who experiences the happiness and grief of the waking as well as the dream is the *Jeeva* or the soul." But to say that the 'I' which exists in the waking and the 'I' that exists in the dream are one and the same, what support of an experience is there? In the deep sleep the phenomenon of the 'I' itself does not exist. It being so, which is the 'I' that experiences all the three states? Its absolute truth is the Witness of the three states alone; that 'Witness' is really *Brahman* alone. Therefore, to know

Rarest Archives

or understand that we are of the essential nature of the knower, the doer and the enjoyer is wrong or fallacious. When observed from the viewpoint of the three states, we are not of the essential nature of the knower but of the essential nature of Pure Knowledge or Consciousness Itself; we are not doers and enjoyers but are of the essential or innate nature of immutable Pure or Absolute Bliss alone. Therefore, the ultimate truth is nothing but that — "I am of the essential nature of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness, Pure Bliss alone." Because for one who has intuitively known or experienced thus in the above manner no shackles or restrictions or binding whatsoever of *Samsaara* or the mundane life (of a circle of births and deaths) exist, he is ever Liberated or Emancipated. This opinion is implicit in the sentence — 'One who knows this Truth (of the essential nature of *Atman* or the Self) is a *Jeevanmukta* or a Liberated or Realized Soul while in this present human body."

167. Our essence of Being is indivisible and undifferentiated :

In the world that appears to us there are divisions of the types — real, unreal; knowledge, ignorance; happiness, grief — existence, knowledge or consciousness and happiness seem to be the qualities or characteristics of certain objects; they seem to have birth and destruction too. Even so, these divisions and differences are mere appearances only. Although it appears that we observe these divisions in the waking and experience them too, in deep sleep we exist in the form of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness and Pure

Rarest Archive

Bliss, devoid of divisions and differentiations. Because in deep sleep these names and forms have merged in our essential nature of Being alone, to say that — 'In the waking divisions and differentiations have been caused to that essential nature of Being by those names and forms' — also is mere misconception or delusion. Because our thinking or believing that — 'In deep sleep there does not exist anything whatsoever and that there we suffer from forgetfulness and that there is non-existence of happiness and grief' — is from the waking viewpoint alone; from that belief or thinking there is no harm or danger to the philosophical truth or teaching based on a comprehensive or plenary viewpoint of the three states of consciousness.

168. Even the phenomena of the three states of consciousness is merely a device or strategy to know or Intuit the Ultimate Reality:

It should not be believed that in the waking the Ultimate Reality gets transformed into the forms of *Jeeva* or the soul and the *Jagat* or the world; there we experience *Samsaara* or the mundane existence and in deep sleep all these somehow dissolve and get merged in one Reality only. For, deep sleep, dream and waking — among these three phenomena there is no kind of relationship whatsoever of time, space and causation. These three states are merely the false appearances that are seen in the Ultimate Reality. These do not exist one by the side of another, nor do they occur as events one after another. Only by observing from the waking viewpoint one has to bring to mind the concepts of the dream and the deep

Rarest Archive

sleep; by comparing with the dream and the deep sleep states one has to form the concept of the type — "This is waking". When we do not compare one with another, no state is in itself waking, dream or deep sleep. Such a dream alone is the phenomenon of *Avasthaatraya* or the three states of conciousness ! It being so, how unjustifiable it is to imagine the Ultimate Reality as having been in one particular form in one of these states and then It having got transformed into another form in another state ! Some people imagine or conceive that in the waking there exists a world made up of gross elements, in the dream that very world gets transformed into a world made up of subtle elements and in deep sleep it, i. e. the world, assumes the form of "*Kaaranaavidya*" or "the causal Ignorance". This also is a vain or futile imagination or concept alone. For this too there does not exist any support of any experience whatsoever. In deep sleep as well as in the waking and the dream *Atman* or the Self (*Saakshi* or the Witness) who is of the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality or Pure Consciousness ever exists in the form of Pure Consciousness and Pure Bliss alone, exists ever devoid of the manifested world — (*Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya Vaartika* 4-3-1908, 1909). In deep sleep we are not conscious of the world, while we are conscious of it in the waking and the dream — this type of division or differentiation itself is *Maaya* or illusion caused by the waking viewpoint. For, as it is stated above, **deep sleep, dream and waking — these three are a kind of dream alone ....** (*Aitareya Upanishad* 1-12). This dream is caused to a *Jeeva* or soul when he is in the sleep of the form of being ignorant of the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*. When he wakes up from this beginningless

Rarest Archives

sleep by Knowledge (of the Self), he comes to know — "*Atman* does not get born; He does not have deep sleep or dream ; in fact, apart from Him there does not exist a second entity at all"— (*Gaudapaada Kaarika* 1-16). Vedanta philosophy does not say that the phenomenon of the states exists absolutely or in the ultimate analysis at all; to those who say that these three states exist, it depicts or indicates the essential nature of the Witness of these three phenomena and then delineates that that essential nature of the Witness alone is the Ultimate Reality and that in It these phenomena of the three states too are a mere concept or imagination only. To the statement of the elders or our traditional teachers — **"By superimpositions and rescissions (Adhyaaropa and Apavaada) the Reality which is devoid of the manifold world is explained or described elaborately."** This alone is the real Vedantic teaching.

169. The examination of the experience of the Present moment :

Any dialectician can frame an indiscriminate or illogical question like : "Statements aobut 'previous states' are all memory; to talk about 'future states' is mere anticipation. Therefore, our experience is purely belonging to the present moment, is it not ? It being so, how can your formulating the philosophical truth on the foundation of dream and deep sleep be sustained or firmly supported ? Now we are not sleeping, nor are we seeing any dream also; we are in the waking. Even the waking, barring the present moment, all the rest can be included either in the past memory or the future anticipation. The previous object does not exist now, future object is not yet

Rarest Archiver

born. Besides, if the present moment is taken up for consideration, that too as soon as it is taken up for consideration — it escapes or slips away and becomes a thing of the past It being so, where is the question of the determination of Reality on the support of the experience of the three states ?" Even then, there is no harm or danger to the philosophical teaching of Vedanta. Even if one remains stubborn in saying -- 'The present moment's experience alone is beyond doubt or is certain, and all else, being either memory or anticipation, cannot be the means or proof'-- it is not possible to discard or refute dream and deep sleep experiences (which are universally accepted). For, even when saying — 'At the present moment I am awake' -- we have invariably the experiences of dream and deep sleep which are quite queer when compared to the waking. If the concepts or beliefs of dream and deep sleep are given up, absolutely, i. e. without any trace or taint of relativity, the concept or belief of waking itself cannot arise or be there. This fact we have previously indicated. It is not possible to bundle up these dream and deep sleep experiences either in memory or in anticipation or expectation, saying that they are either events previous to the present moment or future events compared to the present moment. For, the fact that — 'Memory as well as anticipation must be related to the present flow of time' — we come to know only by the nature of the knowledge or consciousness of the series of the previous and the future wakings. But whether it is deep sleep or dream, like the previous and future wakings, we do not reckon it in our experience that they belong to the line of the present series

Rarest Archiver

or flow of time. Although now dream and deep sleep are perceptible to our Intuitive experience, the facts that — "In the deep sleep there does not exist time itself at all and in the dream another queer flux or flow of time exists" — we reckon in our experience itself. Therefore, in what we now assume as the experience of the present moment those phenomena also must perforce be included Now what are all the things that the present moment's experience comprise? The objects that are being known (viz. dream, deep sleep, the present moment's waking) and the waking 'I' -- the knower. It is not possible for any one to avoid or evade these two phenomena. The 'I' that witnesses the dream, the deep sleep and the waking is one alone; there are no three witnesses like one for the experience of the dream, another for the experience of the deep sleep and yet another for the experience of the waking. Besides, deep sleep means the 'I' alone who is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness; for, I am now experiencing That, and in That it appears to me that there does not exist any object whatsoever. Dream and waking — if these phenomena are observed keenly, both of them cannot co-exist; that means, if dream is taken into the reckoning, the waking goes out or skips out, and if waking is taken into the reckoning, then the dream skips out. Therefore, to say that — "Mutually exclusive phenomena like those two, viz. dream and waking, exist in one and the same moment of time" — will amount to rank indiscrimination; they will disappear merely by confronting them mutually. Because the present moment belongs to waking, waking does not exist in dream and because dream does not exist in waking, the phenomenon or concept of 'moment' also will

Rarest Archives

disappear. Anyway it amounts to our saying — "Barring the Witnessing Principle, viz. our essential nature of Pure Consciousness or *Saakshi,* nothing else whatsoever has existence at all." Therefore, the facts — 'Because we assumed the dream to be a memory or recollection alone, the present moment appears to be the waking' and 'If dream is observed from the dream viewpoint alone, the waking moment is not in any way superior or inferior to the dream' — are established. Especially if observed from the deep sleep viewpoint, everything is brushed aside and the Pure Consciousness alone remains in Its own glory; for, to say — 'I am now experiencing deep sleep' — it is contradictory. The fact that it is not memory has been mentioned above already. Therefore, it becomes established that our essential nature of Being alone is appearing as the three states and all of them are equal to one another. It becomes evident that the phenomena of deep sleep, dream and waking — all are the Ultimate Reality alone of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness, and not anything else. Therefore, the philosophical truth that we mentioned in the previous section, viz. "The states are, like the reflection of our face that is seen in a mirror, merely universal phonomena which are used as a device to know or Intuit the form of reflection of the Ultimate Reality and not independent entities existing in and by themselves *per se*" — stands out as the final verdict of the philosophical science of Vedanta

170. The reason for not discussing here the theories about appearance of false objects (Khhyaativaadas) :

In this book so far we have not discussed the

Rarest Archive

theories on **Khhyaati** The nacre - silver, the rope-snake etc — how do these false objects appear ? — Theories dealing with such questions are called **Khhyaativaada** or theories regardin the appearnce of false objects. *Akhhyaati, Anyathaa, Khhyaati, Aatma Khhyaati, Asat Khhyaati, Anirvachaneeya Khhpaati* etc. such many theories about *Khhyaoti* exist among the disputants or dialecticians of our country. Among the thinkers and philosophers of the Western countries too these kinds of theories are abundant. As these theories of *Khhyaati* or appearance of false objects are based on the logic of the waking viewpoint, they cannot become the final verdict ; the defect of logic, viz. 'There is no finality reached in logic' — is ever inherent in those theories. Here in this book we have made an attempt to the extent possible to bring home clearly the profound philosophical teaching that — "The phenomenon of a false object is not different from the real Pure Existence ; the phenomenon of false knowledge is not different from the Ultimate Reality of Pure Consciousness or Knowledge; the phenomenon of grief or misery is not different from the Ultimate Reality of Pure Bliss or Happiness." In our methodology the auspicious philosophical teaching that Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss alone, from the waking viewpoint, is manifesting Itself as the divisions or distinctions of 'real' and 'false' etc The existence, ignorance and grief of the false appearance are merely the semblance or fallacy of the Ultimate Reality — that means, that part of names and forms that appear in them are merely the semblance of the Ultimate Reality. Even then, the parts of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness and Pure Bliss of the Ultimate Reality are concealed or hidden in them invariably— (*Brihadaaranyaka*

Rarest Archive

Vaartika 3-3-41). Therefore, just like we include the snake, which is a semblance of the rope, in the part 'this' alone which is appearing along with the rope alone, similarly our methodology becomes a means to include the appearances of false forms in the Entity or Reality of Pure Existence — Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss only. Because the philosophical teaching evolved from this methodology stands on the support of the comprehensive or plenary Intuitive experience, there is no fear or threat that this will be assailed or falsified some time or other.

171. The examination of the opinion of those who say that— 'Because the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality is beyond the ambit of logic, attainment of the Intuitive experience which becomes one with that Reality alone is the right path' ;

The meaning of the statement about the Intuitive knowledge of the Ultimate Reality of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Blise (*Satchidaananda Tattwa Jnaana)*, which we have propounded in this book, can be understood by everyone. As some among us Vedantins say, we have not made any unacceptable or illogical or unjustifiable division of the type — 'The knowledge of the Ultimate Reality' is one, 'Its **Saakshaatkaara** or materialization (literally), i. e. practical attainment of that Intuitive experience' is another. Some ancient protagonists were saying that after knowing or understanding the unitary knowledge of the Reality, stated or enunciated in the *Vedas*, through the means of the Vedic sentences, it is essential to get that knowledge 'materialized', and for that

Rarest Archiver

purpose one has to practice Yoga. Even today, some people have the same opinion. "The Ultimate Reality is not accessible or attainable through dry logic. Therefore, merely by discussing no benefit whatsoever accrues. Getting rid of the mundane materialistic concepts as well as behaviour, we must imbibe sublime or profound feelings of love and devotion towards God and cultivate relevant behaviour too; by the strength of that practice alone the 'materialization' of the Ultimate Reality will occur" — Thus some people among the present-day Vedantins are saying For the knowledge to accrue the mind has to be pure; if the mind has to be purified, then the disciplines like *Amaanitwa Adambhitwa* etc., i e shedding of egoism, practising humility etc. are extremely essential; in this respect, no one has a different opinion. **But Some people are of the opinion that apart from the theoretical knowledge of Atman or the Self (the Ultimate Reality), the practical Saakshaatkaara or materialization or actual experience of Atman should be attained, and if that Saakshaatkaara has to accrue, Yoga practices as well as sublime devotion or love too are essential. This especially can never be proper or justifiable.** For, *Saakshaatkaara* or materialization of the Ultimate Reality is not a scientific knowledge or *Vidya* by which one's being becomes 'possessed' or sublimated' by God; we should never think or believe that 'attainment of Pure Consciousness of *Atman*' is a kind of excited, elated or inspired state; even if such a kind of emotion or feeling or highly elated or inspired state is attained by any one, it will never remain as a permanent state. In case it remains permanent, can it be determined as the Ultimate Reality ? If the *Saakshaatkaara* of the Ultimate Reality were to be attained by practising *Yoga*

Rarest Archive

exercises or some other kinds of repetitive practices or exercises *(Prasankhyaana)*, that resultant state would become merely the experience of that particular individual aspirant alone and not the **subject-matter or goal of the scientific treatise of the Ultimate Reality.** To correlate the extra-ordinary experiences of *Yogis* to the science of the Ultimate Reality will demolish or destroy the fundamental or basic rule or principle that the determination of the Ultimate Reality must and should be done on the support of the universal or everyone's experiences here and now only. Many among us do not have the experiences of *Yoga* ; it being so, to say that — "*Yogis* can create their own dreams, can transform them too ; they are endowed with the extrovert or external knowledge or consciousness in their deep sleep ; they are having the knowledge of the body which is created or attained after this present body dies ; although events of the past, the present and the future are concealed or hidden from us laymen, for them *Yogis* these are perceivable" etc. etc — is nothing but betraying one's incapability or lack of suitable qualification in the examination or discrimination about the Ultimate Reality. The facts that '*Yoga* is opposed to the philosophical truth or teaching of Vedanta' (*Brahma Sutras* 2-1-3) and 'The *Samaadhi* that is attained through *Yoga* is not necessary for attainment of the purpose or benefit of Vedantic science, (*Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya* 1-4-7) — have been clarified by our forbears themselves. Another point is : The goal or purpose of the human birth or existence is not to become one with the essential nature of Truth (*Satya*), Consciousness (*Jnaana*), Bliss (*Aananda*) at all. **Really, all human beings — why human beings alone ? For that matter, all creatures, even inanimate or insentient objects — are all of the**

Rarest Archive

essential nature of Truth, Consciousness and Bliss alone. But only because we do not 'know' that it is so, all the vicissitudes of mundane existence are being 'experienced'. We are having the misconception that we are endowed with the mutability or the distinctiveness of the waking ego; we are having the innate belief that the body, the life force, the mind, the intellect, the ego — which exist in the waking, are all fences or hindrances which never spare us or which we can never get rid of. This alone is Avidya or Ignorance. In deep sleep we may, not be having the 'binding' of these phenomena; in *Yoga Samaadhi* and such other states too that binding or restriction may disappear. So what? All of them are 'liberation' for merely a fleeting moment of time or small spells of time. As soon as we wake up from deep sleep, as usual all the vicissitudes of mundane human existence are manifesting themselves before us. Even after getting out of *Samaadhi* or trance all the divisions or distinctions like 'I', 'the rest'; the distinctions of the 'knower', 'the means of knowledge' and 'the known object'; the distinctions of 'the doer', 'the agent of action', 'the action' and 'the fruit of action'; the distinctions of 'the enjoyer', 'the means of enjoyment' and the object of enjoyment' — all these will necessarily manifest themselves; like us many souls will appear; once again the belief that — 'these things or phenomena seen are real' — will raise its head. For a real evaluation of the phenomena like *Saakshaatkaara* or materialization of a deity that is invoked by a devotee and *Yoga Samaadhi* or *Yogic* trance, it will become quite essential to make an elaborate examination of the *Yoga* philosophy. That topic is beyond the scope and objective of this book. For the

Rarest Archive

time being, it is enough if it is remembered that the fruits of any spiritual disciplines or practices of this type are not eternal. Therefore, what is to be attained by us is neither the disappearance of these distinctions or divisions, nor their destruction; it is the destruction of the belief or faith of reality that we have naturally, but misconceivably, pledged in them. If as a result of making our deliberation based on the comprehensive or plenary viewpoint of the three states of consciousness it is realized or cognized that — "All this is the division or distinction brought about or wrought by the viewpoint of *Avidya* or Ignorance (of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness or *Atman*)" — then immediately we will Intuitively know that — "The world of this kind of various divisions and differences never existed at all apart from my *Atman* of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness–Pure Bliss" — and we will have solace or a sense of fulfilment of Life's goal. Therefore, we have described here the methodology of the three states of consciousness alone which teaches such an auspicious and profound philosophical Truth.

(B) Benefits Of The Knowledge Of The Ultimate Reality

172. The disputes as well as confrontations or conflicts among philosophical schools will end :

Anybody may ask the question — "What is the

Rarest Archive

benefit accruing from the knowledge of the Vedanta philosophy ?"

1. First and foremost, the scientific treatise on the Ultimate Reality will propound a philosophical or spiritual Truth which is beyond doubt.

2. Because the viewpoint that is followed in this school of philosophy has taken for consideration all the three states and because what objects the other disputants can imagine or conceive are included in these three states alone — (*Gaudapaada Kaarika Bhashya 4-88*), we will not be responsible or answerable to the defect of incompleteness, inadequacy or a lack of comprehensive outlook of the type — 'Such and such an entity or category or reality of an object or phenomenon has not been taken into the reckoning', i. e. no defect whatsoever of contradiction to any empirical or mundane experience can ever be levelled against this Vedantic teaching.

3. Because we have exemplified or demonstrated that the defect of incompleteness or a lack of comprehensive or all-consuming outlook lurks in all theories or doctrinal systems which can deliberate on the strength of the logical viewpoint of the waking, it will amount to our putting up a restrictive or prohibitive fence or fortification around dry logic, which has no finality or stability. As time and space too are confined within the state alone, there is no room for the doubt that — "The deliberation based on the three states of consciousness may, at some time or other in the future, be falsified. "Therefore,

Rarest Archive

there is no possibility for any doubt whatsoever lurking in our mind regarding the final philosophical Truth taught by this school of philosophy. Because for the other schools of philosophy which take into their consideration only a part of the objective sphere that part of their sphere of view or inquiry alone becomes the subject-matter of their deliberation or discrimination, there is no opposition whatsoever between them and the comprehensive philosophy of *Advaita* or non-dual Ultimate Reality. Therefore, what Sri Gaudapaada has stated, viz. "This philosophy does not give any scope for disputation, nor does it give any scope for opposition" — (*Gaudapaada Kaarika 4-2*) — is quite in accordance with facts and Reality. Anyway, thus that — **'This philosophy of the Ultimate Reality reaches a finality' — is in itself the first and foremost benefit accruing from this Intuitive knowledge.**

173. The fruits that accrue to a Jnaani or a realized soul and the benefit that the world obtains from the Jnaani :

As a result of the establishment or determination of the 'Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality' beyond doubt, the mind begets a kind of unrivalled and unsurpassed satisfaction. In the minds of those who do not know this truth the innate identification or affinity with the waking remains as a Gordian-knot which cannot be untied. In them both as regards their own essential nature of Being and as regards the deliberation about the external objects, misconception alone has spread with all its ramifications. It is their belief invariably that — 'We are of an innate nature of doership and

Rarest Archive

enjoyership; therefore, by performing various kinds of actions and religious rites, by acquiring desirable fruits of action in this world, in other future worlds or in other future births too and by avoiding undesirable fruits we must attain salvation or eternal happiness." As a result of this innate belief in their heart the tree of desires has got its roots strongly and firmly established or ensconced. But for those who have known the truth that — "Our essential nature of Pure Consciousness or the Ultimate Reality is beyond the triad of — action, the means of action and the fruit of action; It is of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss; That alone is our *Atman* or Self; herefore there is no desire; because there is no desire, there does not remain any action that we have to perform (to achieve any fruit of that action). Not only that, because they come to know that they are not of the essential nature of enjoyers at all, but at the same time that they are of the essential nature of Eternal Bliss, the fruits or results of the past actions that they had performed also cannot affect them; only if that past action germinates, then alone it can give its result or fruit, is it not? If the latent effect or impression (*Samskaara*) of action has to germinate, the manure as well as fresh flowing water which sustains it, viz. the feeling or belief of doership and enjoyership is essential. In the case of the *Jnaani* or an emancipated soul because both these are not existent, there is neither any scope or possibility of his past action getting germinated nor the sowing of the seeds of any fresh actions. It being so, the *Shruti* or scripture says that by *Jnaana* or Knowledge the three fruits of removal of all doubts (Sakala Samshaya Nivrutti), destruction of desires (Kaama

Rarest Archives

Naasha) and destruction of action (Karma Kshaya) will accrue. — (*Mundaka Upanishad* 2-2-8). "That *Saakshi Chaitanya* or Witnessing Pure Consciousness, by virtue of which one is observing (Intuiting) the dream state as well as the waking state, that *Chaitanya* or Pure Consciousness alone is one's *Atman* or Self, who is greater as well as more pervasive than both these states — One who knows this truth does not grieve." — (*Kathopanishad* 2-1-4). "When one knows that all existent objects are nothing but *Atman* alone, then what does it mean to say that to that person who has realized oneness or unity (of the Ultimate Reality) there is attachment, there is grief ?" — (*Ishaavaasya Upanishad* 7). "To one who is devoid of the body, the onslaught of the desirables and the undesirables cannot exist at all." — (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 8-12-1) etc. etc. Such scriptural texts are singing the praises of the sublime fruits that accrue to one who is rid of Ignorance or *Avidya* (of one's essential nature of Pure Consciousness or *Atman*). Why state more ? To those holy people who have realized without doubt the fact that — "The phenomenon of the three states itself is a false appearance that is imagined or conceived in (i. e. superimposed on) the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss which is our own *Atman* or Self" — there is no birth, no old age, no death, no disease, no misery or distress, no affliction from desire etc., no elation, no fear, no gain, no loss, nothing to be known, nothing to be done or performed, nothing to be achieved ; they are in all respects people who have attained all that is to be attained in life, i. e. they have achieved life's goal. — (*Chaandogya Upanishad* 7-26-2 ; *Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 2-1-276, 277, 278) ;

Rarest Archives

being already of the essential nature of *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality, now they have merged in the essential nature of *Brahman*. — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-4-6).

What we have stated so far is the benefit accruing to the *Jnaanis*, who are liberated. Further, **what is the benefit accruing to the people who are in the region or environment where Jnaanis live or exist? —** This question may be deliberated upon to a little extent. Although *Jnaanis* are people who have the sense of fulfilment in all respects, they are not in the least lethargic; although they have no work whatsoever to be done for their own sake, they will be performing acts for the welfare or well-being of the people in general without any sense of attachment and will be prompting or inducing others to perform their respective duties or discharge their respective responsibilities (*Geeta* 2-25, 26). Whatever work they may be doing, there is no possibility of their giving up or losing grip over their sense of non-doership or *Akartrutwa Buddhi*— (*Geeta* 4-18). The whole gamut of action the means of action action, the fruits of action — all these have become, to their Intuitive vision, *Brahman* of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss alone (*Geeta* 4-24). Therefore, while performing any particular action the conviction that they are of the essential nature of non-doership alone subsists and persists with them (*Geeta* 5-8). Because they have invariably a sense of the existence of *Brahman* everywhere without any difference of superiority or inferiority (*Geeta* 5-18), they have an equanimous attitude or outlook everywhere without any feelings of enmity or friendship (*Geeta*-6-9).

Rarest Archive

Because in them the disciplines or qualifications mentioned in the *Geeta* like the characteristics of non-hater etc. (*Geeta* 12-13 to 19) and the characteristics of non-egoism etc. (*Geeta* 13-7 to 11) exist effortlessly and innately, i. e. as their very nature, they are suitable to serve as models or exemplars to be emulated by the people who have a desire to perform or observe the disciplines for self-purification. Even the common run of people who are not *Mumukṣhus* or aspirants for Liberation obtain the fruits of their desires by worshipping them or paying homage to them alone. For, because they have attained oneness or unity with God, the Almighty, their wish alone would be *Ishwara's* or the Lord's or Creator's wish, their blessings alone become *Ishwara's* or the Lord's blessings. — (*Mundaka Upanishad* 3-1-18).

174. This alone is the foundation for the doctrines or teachings of a universal religion :

The fact that the truths or teachings of a universal religion will be established indisputably is the second benefit accruing from this Intuitive Knowledge. Does God exist or not ? What is the relationship between a *Jeeva* or soul and *Ishwara* or the Lord ? What is the relationship between the world and *Ishwara*, the Lord ? What is the essential nature of *Ishwara* ? Is He with form or devoid of any form ? Is He with qualities or characteristics or without qualities or characteristics ? What is the value or worth of the preceptors of religion and scriptural texts of religion ? Which are the disciplines to be practised ? What is the essential nature of the fruits accruing from them ?

Rarest Archives

Do rebirth and other worlds (as mentioned in all religious texts) exist? What is their value or worth? — Such and the like considerations or questions of a universal religion or a religious faith acquiesced in by all right-thinking people of the world can be established on the foundation of everyone's experience. This supreme benefit is possible to be achieved by this philosophy. Because the Ultimate Reality alone, which is of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss, is, in the empirical sphere, called 'the Supreme Lord' (*Parameshwara*) for both the world and us, the human beings in general, it is possible to find out satisfactory answers to all these questions. The statement that — "*Ishwara* or the Lord, being the omnipresent or all-pervading Reality, exists everywhere" — does not become a mere voral statement, but becomes an eternal truth to the letter; because the attainment of oneness or unity with *Ishwara* or the Ultimate Reality alone becomes the supreme goal of life, all the dealings and actions in accordance or in keeping with that goal will become good, auspicious or virtuous actions. All others opposed to it become vicious or inauspicious actions. Further, for these actions too the fruits or results also will be suitably established. It also becomes established that the actions and their respective fruits are belonging to the state of empirical or mundane dealings alone wherein we have accepted the doership and enjoyership to be real. All those religious texts in which it has been taught so as to be in agreement with this Ultimate Reality — they will all become genuine religious texts; all those who preach and practise in accordance with the teachings about this Ultimate Reality will be the genuine religious preceptors. For

Rarest Archives

such and many other main aspects of religion, barring this Vedanta philosophy, no other school of philosophy whatsoever can provide any reasonable justification based on universal acceptance. There are many more important topics pertaining to a universal religion which are to be deliberated upon, but in this book which is predominantly philosophical we have not taken up all such topics for consideration.

175. A sound support or foundation provided for ethics and morals :

By the means of this philosophical teaching a firm support is provided for ethics and morals. This is the third benefit. What is meant by a religious or righteous act ? What is meant by irreligious or unrighteous act ? How should man behave in a society or community ? What is the purpose of political science or the ethical principles on the basis of which the political systems should operate ? Is there any utility or purpose served by divisions like castes (*Varna*) and stages of life (*Aashrama*) ? — Such and many other like questions belong to the consideration of ethics or morals. In giving an answer to these questions we can formulate the general dictum, viz. 'What is suitable or helpful for the knowledge of the Ultimate Reality is a righteous act and the three-fold attitude alone which causes or creates a motivation or desire for such a righteous act becomes ethics or morals'. This can be treated as the principal aphorism. Because selfishness of the type of having innate identification with one's 'I' notion is itself an enemy for all ethics or morals, all authoritative texts on morals or ethics preach that one

Rarest Archive

should give up or conquer the identification with 'I' notion i. e. one's egoism. But for man this 'I' notion or egoism has become so very fascinating ! Why should one get rid of it at all ? — Such a predicament or difficult problem is born. So far whatever authoritative texts on ethics or morals that man has formulated by dint of his intellectual excellences or capabilities have not been able to provide a fully suitable or satisfactory answer or solution. But in the methodology propounded by Vedantic philosophy an excellent, reasonable justification is available for this problem. For instance, the teaching that — "Although the 'I' notion or egoism itself is really wanted more than all else, this identification with the 'I' notion is not the Absolute or Ultimate Reality ; our *Atman* or Self alone, of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss is the innate nature of the Ultimate Reality. This ego or 'I' notion alone, which is, in truth, the reflection of Pure Existence (*Sadaabhaasa*), the reflection of Pure Consciousness (*Chidaabhaasa*) and the reflection of Pure Bliss (*Sukhaabhaasa*), has become popular or well-known as the 'I' notion in our empirical or mundane dealings. If this egoism or 'I' notion is subdued, the essential nature of *Atman* or Self, which is the substratum for this 'I' notion and which is of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss, becomes boldly manifested. That alone is the supreme goal or purpose of our carrying on all our *Vyavahaara* or empirical dealings. Therefore, ethics or morals in keeping with such a goal or prime purpose must be followed in society" — will become the authoritative ethical science in accordance with Vedanta.

Rarest Archive

176. The greater value that will accrue to the empirical or physical sciences :

The fact that by this viewpoint all the empirical sciences will get a greater value is the **fourth benefit.** All the multifariousness that appears in the world is the greatness or excellence of *Ishwara* or the Lord. For, the phenomenon of the world does not exist apart from *Ishwara* or the Lord or Creator ; it is one of His magnificence or superhuman power. If any extra-ordinary thing — whichever part of this world it may be existing in — is praised or adored in exclusive or superlative terms, it amounts to elaborating upon that Supreme Lord's magnificence or greatness alone. From that point of view, **all the empirical or physical sciences become a part of Adhyaatma Vidya or the Knowledge of the Self or Atman alone.** Similarly, the phenomenon of the mind which is a means to know the external world becomes a handy mirror of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness -Pure Bliss. Making the phenomena of existence, knowledge or consciousness and happiness which are reckoned in this mind as doorways alone we fathom or discern this Ultimate Reality. By the character or calibre of the mind alone man shows himself to be divine or Satanic or devilish Therefore, the elaborate science which teaches the innate nature of mind also is a big section or part of *Adhyaatma Vidya* or the Knowledge of *Atman* or the Self. Hence we have to assume that the consideration of the mind and the external objects as steps to the Intuitive knowledge of the Ultimate Reality. It is not possible at all to discard or condemn any science whatsoever as being mundane or empirical. But how

Rarest Archive

far does the boundary or limits of the physical sciences extend? Why can't they jump over those boundaries or limits and proceed beyond? If in addition to these questions the fact that the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss is the substrate or foundation for the objects or substances of all those empirical sciences is brought to mind or realized by us, then a path or way shows up to solve the question as to how and in what manner the physical sciences should be developed and how to make them helpful to' human beings in general.

177. A guide for educational systems:

Because all knowledge is born for the sake of the progress of man, while our young people are being educated the question as to which method should be followed or adopted is provided with an excellent indication by this philosophy of Vedanta. As we read the history of the methods adopted in the past in education, it becomes clear that at various periods of time the educational systems were different. When there arises a conflict among these systems, it has become difficult to provide a final satisfactory answer or solution to the question as to how much aspect of a particular system should be utilized or adopted. If it is true that the goal of human life itself is to Intuitively know here and now the Ultimate Reality of the essential nature of Pure Existence - Pure Consciousness - Pure Bliss, then the question as to which ethics or morals should be followed in the system of education will become a very important

Rarest Archiver

aspect. In this matter too the Vedantic philosophy guides us to find an amicable solution.

(C) Conclusive Remarks

178. The Ultimate Reality should be learnt through the doorway of the states alone :

So far we have propounded in various ways the fact that when the experience of the states of waking, dream and deep sleep is taken as an object and considered from an unbiassed viewpoint, the auspicious or blissful philosophical truth that the Entity of the essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss alone is the Ultimate Reality will evolve. In order to determine the Ultimate Reality these states alone are the doorways for us. Although the Ultimate Reality is appearing to us in the forms of these states alone, It exists in Its essential nature alone. In case the Entity called the Ultimate Reality were existing separate from these three states, then it would not have been possible for man to know It at all. For, barring the experience of these three states man does not have any other experience at all. Therefore, if the Ultimate Reality is beyoud the experience of these three states, the scriptural texts which teach such an Absolute or Transcendental Truth

Rarest Archives

would themselves have become futile or worthless, or it would have amounted to saying that the Ultimate Reality Itself does not exist. — (*Maandukya Bhashya* 7). But the real position is not so. The Ultimate Reality Itself is appearing in the forms of these three states of consciousness; in It alone -- deep sleep, in which the Ultimate Reality is not 'known'; waking and dream, in both of which It is misconceived — these three states are occurring as phenomena. Therefore, if these deep sleep, waking and dream are falsified or subsumed by means of right Intuitive Knowledge, then the Ultimate Reality manifests Itself as It is.

179. The Ultimate Reality is known by Intuitive experience alone:

If the question — "What is the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality?" — is put, an answer following the methodology or the line of consideration or Intuitive reasoning adopted in this book can be given in the manner — "It is of the essential nature of Pure Existence - Pure Consciousness - Pure Bliss (*Satya Jnaana Aananda* or *Satchidaananda Swaroopa*)". For, by the deliberation that we have carried out so far it is established that It is the essence of existence, knowledge and happiness. But if properly observed, to call It the essence of existence etc. also is wrong only. For, existence, knowledge and happiness are the names that we have given or assumed to some phenomena which we have perceived from the waking viewpoint alone. To the question — "How does the Ultimate Reality exist in Its essential nature or in Itself *per se*?" — how at all will it be a proper

Rarest Archive

answer if a name which is formulated from the (biassed) waking viewpoint is given? Existence, knowledge and happiness are the names that we give to objects or phenomena in the waking for the sake of various transactions that we carry out But really speaking, **in the Ultimate Reality there does not exist any cause whatsoever for the transaction of any word.** It is not a substance (*Dravya*), not a quality (*Guna*), not an action (*Kriya*), not any relationship (*Sambandha*), neither the category of genus (*Saamaanya*) nor the particular (*Vishesha*), not non-existence (*Abhaava*); It is not a knower (*Jnaatru*), not a known object (*Jneya*); not a doer (*Kartru*), not an action (*Kriya*), not a means of action (*Kaaraka*), not a result or fruit of action (*Phala*). It being so, how can It at all be proper to call It by any name? All words are the names of objects or phenomena that exist in the waking. But the Ultimate Reality does not exist in the waking; the waking itself is a certain appearance that is 'illumined' or that 'shines' in the Ultimate Reality. The objects that appear in the waking and their names — are nothing but the false appearances only that are manifested in It, i. e, the Ultimate Reality. Therefore, that Entity which is apart from these two phenomena of the name and the object having the name and which is their essence alone — that alone is the Ultimate Reality — (*Maandukya Bhashya* 2). The division of 'the name' and 'the named' is itself false. The name, the named, their division - all these are the Ultimate Reality alone, which is extremely queer from their form of appearance. Even calling that Ultimate Reality by names like *'Brahman'*, *'Akshara'*, *'Bhooma'*, etc. is also done by imagining or positing or superimposing a relationship between that Ultimate Reality and the

Rarest Archive

states alone, and not to indicate or denote It directly — (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 2-4-253). No name whatsoever is a directly-signifying or denoting means for *Brahman*; not only this, **'Brahman or the Ultimate Reality is an object of Intuition for words like Reality (Satya), Knowledge (Jnaana), Bliss (Aananda), Indestructible (Akshara)' — even such a transaction is carried out for the sake of courtesy or a formality. This fact should be understood clearly.** In our daily parlance, the meaning that has somehow attached itself to a word is called literal meaning (*Vaachyaartha*), and we call the intended or signified meaning of any word or sentence the allegorical or emblematic meaning (*Lakshyaartha*). All the concepts of *'Jahallakshana'*, *Ajahallakshana'* and *'Jahadajahallakshana'* — are formulated in order to indicate the objects which are seen in the waking; therefore, no word whatsoever can indicate even by indirect means the Ultimate Reality. Even so, just as the word, by assigning a symbol or mark, indicates by significance an object which is far away from it, in the same manner words like *'Omkaara'* etc and words like *'Brahman'*, *'Akshara'* etc, indicate or denote the Ultimate Reality. By the mere indication of words which do so somehow, regarding the Ultimate Reality, which is our very essential nature of Being, we on the pretext of those words Intuitively know that Ultimate Reality. Just as those who are asleep, as soon as they are called by their names, get up or wake up (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika* 1-4-861), similarly with the help of these words which indicate or signify the Ultimate Reality the wise aspirant Intuitively knows the Ultimate Reality. In this sense, it is conventional to say that the words teach symbolically the Absolute or Ultimate Reality. But in this regard the absolute truth is: "No

Rarest Archive

word or percept whatsoever can ever objectify this Ultimate Reality" — (*Taittireeya Upanishad* 2-9). If the percepts start to objectify that Reality, immediately that percept itself will merge or mingle with the Ultimate Reality Itself — this fact we have previously (sub-sections 135, 162) explained. Therefore, when we say that our *Atman* or Self who is of the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality, is of the innate nature of Reality (*Satya*), Knowledge (*Jnaana*), Bliss (*Aananda*), by recalling the manner in which in our daily parlance words and sentences denote their meaning, we should not think or conceive that — "The Ultimate Reality is our *Atman* or Self; between us and That Reality there exists an emotional relationship of 'my Lord' or that these concepts of Reality, Knowledge and Bliss are different from one another or that they are blended or mixed into one another" — (*Brihadaaranyaka Vaartika 2-3-12*). Observing in accordance with Intuitive experience we should determine that the Ultimate Reality, *Atman*, Reality, Knowledge, Bliss — all these are one and the same non-dual Entity.

180. The description of the Absolute or Ultimate Reality from the Absolute viewpoint :

If the Ultimate Reality is to be indicated from the Absolute viewpoint alone, then it will have to be stated in the negative manner like — 'not this, not this' alone. To indicate this Ultimate Reality there is no other device at all (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad 2-3-6*). It is not dream, It is not waking, nor is It a form in which both these have joined together; not deep sleep, not to be known, not one that is known, not to be

Rarest Archive

known by imagining with the help of symbols or marks, not a thing to be contemplated upon in the mind alone, not a thing which is suitable to be described by mouth as 'such and such', not a state, not a thing having a state (*Maandukya Upanishad 7*). Therefore, to say that — "It is of the essential nature of Reality, Knowledge, Bliss, i. e. *Satya Jnaana Aananda Swaroopa*, also is not proper or correct in the absolute sense. There is no difference whatsoever in It, no increase or decrease, no inauspicious aspect, there is nothing second to It at all. Even saying that — "It is our *Atman* or Self; we should achieve the fulfilment of life's purpose by attaining It" — all such things are said from the empirical viewpoint alone and not from the Absolute viewpoint of the Ultimate Reality or Pure Consciousness. Really nothing whatsoever is born, nothing is destroyed; there is nothing like anyone is bound by *Samsaara* or the mundane existence of repeated births and deaths, no one who is desirous of attaining Liberation by practising *Saadhana* or religious or spiritual disciplines; there is no one who has attained Emancipation through *Jnaana* or Knowledge of the Self. This alone is the ultimate truth (*Gaudapaada Kaarika 2-32*). There is a convention of calling the Ultimate Reality *'Turiya'* also. (*Maandukya Upanishad 7*). *Turiya* means the fourth one. The Ultimate Reality which is apart from the nature of *Jeevaatman* or the soul who appears with the adjuncts (*Upaadhis*) of the three states of waking, dream, deep sleep and is ever devoid of any adjuncts whatsoever is the essence of these three states. That Reality has no relationship with these three states at all. Because all the three states are 'misconceived' or imagined (through *Avidya*) in that Ultimate Reality. That Reality is eternally devoid

Rarest Archives

of any state. In this sense alone That Reality is *Turiya* or the fourth one only; really, to say that — "Separate from these three states and adjoining or in line with them It is the fourth (in number)" — is not the purport of the scriptural texts at all. Some present-day Vedantins have erroneously taken or understood that '*Turiya*' is a fourth state and that alone is *Samaadhi* or trance. Some others misconceive It to be *Turiyaateeta* — yet another state beyond the '*Turiya*'. These aspects have been erroneously incorporated by people who have a pronounced proclivity towards the *Dvaita* philosophy of *Yoga* (of Patanjali). A true Vedantin should not entertain such delusions or misconceptions.

181. No contradiction or opposition between the 'real' and the 'illusory' natures of the world when observed from two different viewpoints, viz. empirical or Vyaavahaarika and Absolute or Paaramaarthika :

Because when we observe from the Absolute viewpoint the belief that we have a waking state itself becomes false, to believe that such many wakings were experienced in the past through the means of memory and to anticipate in the future too many such wakings will occur to us — all these become delusions only. Because the phenomenon that — 'Outside there exists a world' — stands on the strength or support of this waking alone, that too becomes a delusion ; the belief that — "We exist in the world and carry on our day-to-day transactions invariably" — also becomes a delusion. Similarly, the beliefs that — "Like us, many

Rarest Archive

souls are carrying on empirical transactions in that world"; "Births and deaths keep on occurring to us, and after our death, as a result of the actions or *Karmas* performed in this life we experience future births"; "Just as in this world, in the other future worlds too which yield the fruits of actions we will be experiencing the fruits of our actions" — all such beliefs will become delusions only. Although in our empirical or mundane transactions, being endowed with the three states (*Avasthaavattwa*), being a soul (*Jeevatwa*), manifoldness of souls (*Jeevaanekatwa*), the reality adduced to the external world (*Baahyaprapanchasattwa*), the transmigration of souls (*Jeeva's Prapanchaantargatatwa*), being endowed with the natures of doership and enjoyership (*Kartru Bhoktru Swabhaavatwa*), transmigration to other births and other worlds (*Janmaantara Lokaantara Gamana*) — all these we strongly believe to exist on the strength of the evidential means of perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*) etc., but none of these can stand up against the onslaught of discriminative reasoning based on the comprehensive Intuitive experiences. It becomes established by the devices of Intuitive reasoning (*Anubhavaanga Tarka*) mentioned by us in this book that — "From the empirical viewpoint alone, which is the waking viewpoint and is misconceived because of *Avidya* or ignorance of the essential nature of one's Being as the Self or *Atman* (Pure Consciousness), all these beliefs get value or validity in our workaday world, but after carrying out discriminative examination from the comprehensive (i. e. Intuitive experience) viewpoint of the three states none of these beliefs is sustained or substantiated."

Rarest Archive

But merely by saying that — "From the Absolute viewpoint none of these exists" — in our mundane workaday dealings none of these fail to appear. In the day-to-day world and in our empirical dealings too if deliberation is carried out, it will become evident that these cannot stand the test or rigours of logic or dialectics. But howevermuch logic may demolish them, proving their non-existence, it is not possible for our innate faith in them to disappear. For that reason alone, we have stated that to these there is a **Vyaavahaarika Sattyatwa** or empirical reality. From the Absolute or Ultimate Reality viewpoint these do not get destroyed but are falsified (*Baadhita*). When any object of the type of the rope-snake appears owing to delusion, after one goes very near it and fully examines it, it may not appear thereafter; like the reflection seen in water, the blueness of the sky etc. — even after the correct knowledge is attained they may still continue to appear. For us the disappearance of the illusory object is not at all important; if it is said that — "It is not real" — in reality, the phenomenon of the world does not exist at all even in the form of a delusion. The conviction or sense of certainty that we obtain to the effect that — "By Intuitive knowledge of *Atman* or the Self, even that which gets falsified does not exist at all, and further, even the dealings of 'knowledge' and 'ignorance' are also a delusion only" — is important for us. In fact, that alone is the fruit of Intuitive Knowledge. Just as an axe cuts asunder a tree, Knowledge (*Jnaana*) does not cut asunder *Avidya* or Ignorance, but *Jnaana* or Knowledge indicates the essential nature of the entity and falsifies its ignorance. The Knowledge that — "The world and the repeated births and deaths

Rarest Archive

projected by delusion (*Bhraanti*) did not exist in the past, do not exist now at present, will not exist in the future too" — is itself the falsification of *Avidya* or ignorance (*Sutra Bhashya* 4-1-13 ; *Sambandha Vaartika* 183). Therefore, saying that — "A *Jeevanmukta* or an 'emancipated one' while in this body keeps on carrying out day-to-day dealings like others and is helpful to all people (sub-section 166)" -- is true from the empirical viewpoint alone. From the Absolute or Ultimate Reality viewpoint the statement that — "There are no bondage and liberation etc. at all "-- is also true. There is no mutual contradiction or opposition at all between these two viewpoints. Similarly, with regard to the opinions too of the type — "The world exists really, the world is illusory, the world does not exist at all — it is *Brahman* alone" etc. etc. — we should get the apparent contradictions reconciled by means of adopting the two different viewpoints.

182. The supreme preaching of the Upanishads :

So far we have expounded the 'philosophical teaching' part of Vedanta alone; Vedanta is the philosophical Truth that is preached in the *Upanishads* which form one part of the *Vedas*. As we have stated in the first Chapter of this book, in the *Upanishads* not only the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality is indicated but also considerations regarding the *Vedic* faith are profusely mentioned. *Karma* or rituals and religious rites, *Upaasana* or meditations, *Srishti Sthithi Pralaya* or creation. sustenance and dissolution, souls, rebirths, other worlds, *Maaya* or illusion etc.— are also mentioned in the *Upanishads*. Between them and the philo-

Rarest Archiver

sophical Truth, which is the supreme preaching of the *Upanishads*, what is the relationship that exists? How should we relate the considerations regarding *Yoga* and *Bhakti* or devotion, mentioned in *Smritis* like the *Bhagavad Geeta* etc. to this philosophical teaching of the Ultimate Reality of the *Upanishads?* In the teachings of other Vedanta schools like those of Vishishtha-advaita etc- to what extent are the teachings which are in agreement with the supreme philosophical teaching described so far? In them, which are those aspects that are opposed to this philosophical teaching? Just like Vedanta other schools of philosophy exist in our country as well as in the Western countries, is it not? From among them, from the point of view of imbibing the real essence, how much and what aspect or part should we grasp? How many aspects will have to be discarded or rejected and why?— To consider all these problems following this viewpoint of Vedanta — is also a big task. If that task is fulfilled by adopting the all-comprehensive and Intuitive method of the three states of consciousness as delineated in this book, the doubt in the minds of the ordinary people of the type — "Just like Vedanta, in other philosophical systems too there might be a possibility of yet other philosophical teachings or truths emerging or evolving in accordance with reasoning and experience" — will not raise its head at all. Such doubts will vanish completely.

The Ultimate Reality alone which can never be falsified is the one Entity really existing; That alone is the essence of the world, which is appearing from the empirical viewpoint, comprising multitudes of sentient and insentient things. That alone is being called Paramaatman or the Supreme Being or Self which has pervaded every-

Rarest Archive

thing by Its essential nature of Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss. What we have now known to be our Atman of the nature of the transmigratory soul — that alone is in reality of the essential nature of Satchidaananda Swaroopa or Pure Existence-Pure Consciousness-Pure Bliss. This alone is the Supreme preaching of the Upanishads – (Chaandogya Upanishad 6-8-7).

As this philosophical Truth of Vedanta is arrived at on the strength of the topics propounded in the *Upanishads* that are stated to be the religious texts of ancient seers or sages, it is but natural for many considerations pertaining to the eternal *Vedic* Religion becoming quite essential to be scrutinized and studied for a thorough understanding of the topics and the philosophy in general. However, as we have already pointed out, the philosophical Truth or Reality of Vedanta is not the exclusive possession of the people of any particular religious faith whatsoever. In order to make it known that it is possible for people belonging to any period of time, to any nation, to any religious faith, to deliberate upon and realize the Ultimate Reality and utilize this knowledge to suit their respective situation or circumstances in life, we have given separately its purely philosophical teaching portion only. If this book creates, even to a little extent, the belief that in order to find out the Ultimate Reality that can never be falsified or negated the path that is taught in the *Upanishads* is the only proper one, we will feel our mission is fulfilled. Let the Supreme Lord who is the *Atman* of everyone bless them to gain that staunch belief.

'Om Tat Sat'

ॐ

Rarest Archiver

APPENDIX

SCIENCE AND SPIRITUALITY

(A Brief Comparative Study)

INTRODUCTION

In this space age when the physical sciences have taken stupendous strides macrocosmically into the stellar region and microcosmically into the very core of matter and its minutest particles, man's mind is wholly 'captured and captivated' by the marvels of modern science and he is not in a mood to consider any propositions and precepts of any brand of philosophy. In truth, he feels all the teachings of the various religions or faiths are suspect and they engender and encourage blind faith and superstition.

Yet it is an eternal truth that man cannot live without any faith of some kind or other, first in himself and then in things external to him. For example, he has an abiding faith and credulity in the 'real existence' of the world and its permanence; so also, he puts faith in his own existence for a particular period of time and plans for his future progress and prosperity. Thus he has perforce to have faith in himself and the things and people in the external world for his living or existence. If we consider a bit more carefully, everyone's existence or life can be divided into the subjective aspect or the

Rarest Archive

'I' aspect and the objective or the 'this' aspect. The 'I' aspect includes the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the ego, while the 'this' aspect comprises the external vast universe, both in its macrocosmic and microcosmic aspects, with its animate and inanimate things, time, space, causation etc. It should not be difficult for any intelligent person, especially an educauted one, to discern that the physical sciences have purely an objective approach and not a subjective one. In other words, the physical or empirical sciences use all their sophisticated appliances, gadgets and highly sensitive instruments to probe into things or matter external to the scientist, who uses them, but not to know or find out what his 'I' is made of or comprises. In fact, for this latter consideration of the subjective aspect of life no instrument, howevermuch delicate, sensitive and powerful it may be, is of any utility or consequence at all. Although modern psychology is a science pertaining to the 'psyche' or the mind, it probes into an external mind of another person other than that of the psychologist, and this mordern science, despite its great achievements in discovering curative theories and a large number of medicines, it has adopted purely an 'objective' approach again.

Thus the physical sciences have directed all their attention towarde the objective aspect of life, whereas all the religions and spiritual teachers of the world have taken up for consideration both the subjective and the objective aspects of life in their entirety and have propounded their teachings or tenets for the general well-being and progress of humanity. Just

Rarest Archiver

as there are differences of opinion among the scientists, there are differences in the teachings and doctrines of various religious teachers and preceptors too But Vedanta, as a highly scientific philosophical system using a universally acceptable and comprehensive tri-basic outlook or viewpoint and taking life's experiences in their totality, rises like Colossus of Rhodes above all controversies, conflicts and contradictions of Nature. Its greatness as "the science of all sciences" lies in the fact that all rules, regulations, conventions, concepts and procedures that the physical or empirical sciences adopt in their development and systematization are not only subsumed in its "Ultimate Reality" of Pure Consciousness or *Atman* but are instantly comprehended, assimilated and trancended. In fact, all these mundane concepts become inadequate, unsuitable, and irrelevant when the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or the Self (the Witnessing Principle) in every human being, irrespective of his or her caste, nation, race, sex, age, period etc., is Intuited here and now in keeping with the teachings and guidance of the highly rational scriptural texts, viz. the *Upanishads*. Unfortunately, these pedagogic methods were traditionally handed down from the *Guru* or preceptor to the *Shishya* or disciple in secrecy and personally and in due course, as decadence set in, the most rational methodology of "Superimposition and Rescission" implicit in and through the *Upanishadic* lore was almost lost to the world. However, Sri Shankara, the doyen among the exponents of Vedantic philosophy, has elaborated enough on this traditional methodology in his extant *Bhashyas* or commentaries and that is based on supra-rational Intuitive experience,

Rarest Archive

allowing no room for any ambiguity, anomalies or misgivings.

In these days of highly advanced studies and discoveries in Astrophysics and Cosmology, on the one hand, and the Nuclear or Sub-atomic Physics and Genetic Technology, on the other, it has become almost a fashion for a horde of pseudo-scientists, who profess to be rationalists to the core, to decry or belittle the hoary Indian Culture and spiritual traditions and treatises, saying that all those ancient works, customs and concepts were irrational, unscientific, bordering on superstition and blind faith. Their criticisms and bizarre opinions betray their own lack of acquaintance with and understanding of the voluminous philosophical or spiritual literature in Sanskrit and a false notion of pride in believing that scientists alone can lay claim to critical faculties and a genuine scientific temper or spirit. It will therefore be of immense benefit for the thoughtful, discriminating but unbiassed minds to make a comparative study of the latest theories, speculations and discoveries of some of the most important branches of physical sciences, like Astrophysics, Nuclear or Sub-atomic Physics and Biochemistry and Genetic Technology and the supra-science of Advaita Vedanta and its universal appeal to humanity in general and its comprehensive outlook on life in its entirety.

The scientific study of the macrocosmic aspect of the universe dealing with the physics of stars, planets, galaxies, quasars, Black Holes, the Big Bang and the

Rarest Archiver

Steady State theories adopted to explain the origin of all these celestial phenomena goes by the name of Astrophysics, while the study in depth of the microcosmic aspect dealing with the behaviour and structure of matter at its very core or nucleus, the forces which bind and rule these fundamental particles of matter etc. are called by the name of Nuclear or Sub-atomic Physics. The intermediate range of things in the empirical world, the realm of living matter found on the surface of earth are dealt with in Biology and Biotechnology or Genetics. The entire edifice of modern science is built on a concept of a cosmic evolutionary process, and it deals with three aspects of that evolution, viz. the inorganic, the organic and the psycho - social. While dealing with the inorganic phase, modern science analyses the subtle processes of change that are taking place in the minutest particles of matter even in the realm of the protons and the neutrons, known together as the nucleons or 'the building blocks' of matter. Stretching this study to all the matter that exists in the vastness of the stellar region, modern astrophysicists have built up their complex theories about galaxies, stars like Sun and planets like our earth and moon etc. which revolve round the Sun. The time duration of this evolutionary phase is measured in billions of years or light years. The organic phase deals with the chemical reactions among the various kinds of elementary matter on earth and such other planetary bodies leading to the formation of complex and highly organized macro-molecules like amino acids, proteins, enzymes and deoxyribonucleic acid or DNA culminating in the formation of living cells which are capable of multiplication, metabolism

Rarest Archive

and adaptive regulatory activity. These original unicellular organisms evolved to become living multi-cellular bodies with diverse features ending up in the evolutionary marvel of the human being. The third psycho-social phase of the evolutionary process deals with the slow stages of transformation of the primitive cave-dwelling primate called man into the cultured and civilized modern man, who exhibits a high sense of ethical and moral values and has developed fine arts and the skill of building highly sophisticated cities with skyscrapers and a network of metal roads as well as huge machines and factories Thus modern science considers that in the human being the cosmic evolutionary process has reached its consummation right from the bare protons and neutrons of the interstellar space to the complex neurons of the human skull.

The theories and speculations evolved with regard to galaxies and quasars, through the study and observation of which the modern astrophysicists hope to find the exact origin of the universe, are changing with such swiftness that it is anybody's guess as to what they will be able to prove or disprove the next moment. However, their astounding and revolutionary scientific discoveries in recent decades have helped to induce and inculcate a comprehensive outlook on the universe and its origin, as also bringing humanity closer through the corridors of science. The modern astrophysicists and astronomers believe that by observing the distant galaxies and quasars they get valuable clues which will ultimately lead them to the origin of the universe, since those heavenly bodies represent the state of the universe some ten to 20 billion years ago. The farther we go

Rarest Archives

in space, the farther we go back in time. The scientists also hope that by this observation of distant galaxies and quasars they may be able to resolve the long-drawn controversy between the two opposing theories of cosmogony, viz. the Big Bang Theory, which states that the universe had a definite beginning and is continuously expanding and changing its structure, as against the Steady State Theory, which states that the large-scale structure of the universe remained the same in the past and will continue to remain the same in the future too. Astrophysicists have carried out detailed studies on nearby galaxies and it is now almost certain that other galaxies also contain matter similar to our own galaxy, called "the Milky Way", and are made up of similar stars. It has also been discovered that the galaxies are flying away from each other at tremendous speed and the farther a galaxy is from us, the faster it moves away from us. The recently discovered galaxies are, in fact, receding away from our galaxy with speeds comparable to the speed of light. As of today they should have moved a few billion years out — nearer to 'the edge of the universe' The light that is leaving them will be received by us on this earth planet after more than 20 billion years.

The Big Bang Theory postulates that the universe began as a huge fire ball of extreme density and temperature. The denisty was so high that a tea-spoonful of matter would weigh many billions of tonnes, and the temparature tens of billions of degrees. The huge fire ball then began to expand, exploded and the fragments got cooled. During the expansion and the consequent explosion matter got concentrated

Rarest Archives

in certain places to give rise to the galaxies of stars. The distant galaxies thus give information about that early history of the formation of galaxies which will ultimately lead to an answer regarding the formation of the universe. It is very difficult to observe the distant galaxies as the light received on earth from these galaxies is very limited. However, the astronomers of the University of California, U. S. A., have recently discovered, using very sensitive and sophisticated electronic detectors, to photagraph nine galaxies in the farthermost reaches of the universe which are at least 10,000 million light years away, and one of them, near the Constellation of Leo, is believed to be even more than 12,000 million light years away. To understand the distance involved, one should know the speed of light, which travels with extra-ordinary speed of about 3,00,000 kms. per second. It can circle round the earth in a matter of about one tenth of a second and cover the distance between the earth and the moon — about 4,00,000 kms. — in a little more than a second. Light from the Sun, which lies some 150 million kms. takes about eight minutes to reach the earth. One light year is the distance that light travels in a year, approximately about ten trillion kms., i. e. one followed by 13 zeroes. The nearest star to the solar system — Alphe Centauri — is situated at a distance of a little more than four light years. Our Sun is just an ordinary star among more than a hundred billion stars in the Milky Way Galaxy. It takes more than a hundred years for light to travel from one end of the Milky Way Galaxy to the other. The light received from the farthermost galaxy detected by the California University astronomers is 20 million times as faint as the faintest star that can be seen

Rarest Archive

with the naked eye. In future when the Space Telecope is placed in orbit, the astronomers may be able to observe the distant galaxies in large numbers and in greater detail.

In 1963 Prof. M. Schmidt, who recently visited India, identified the first of the 3,000 odd quasars, which are exceedingly luminous objects bigger than a star but smaller than a galaxy, normally emitting X-rays. While taking the spectrum of one of those objects — 3. C 273 — the brightest quasar recorded so far, Prof. Schmidt noticed a peculiar shift towards longer wavelengths, which ultimately led to the conclusion that these highly luminous objects emitting excessive energy were flying away in the universe fastest. According to Hubble's Law, the larger the red shift in a spectrum the faster the object is receding from the observer. So it came to be known that quasars are the farthest objects in the universe being scanned by the human beings. "Quasars are point-like objects with fuzz or loose volatile matter around them and are moving between 10 to 90 per cent the velocity of light, i. e. 3,00,000 kms. per second, and are probably not much larger than the solar system," Prof. Schmidt said and added that the slowest quasar is receding at a speed of 20,000 kms. per second, whereas for a normal star it is about 600 kms. per second. The farthest of the quasars is some 15 billion light years away, with a red shift of 3.78. No object has been recorded exceeding that limit and so the scientists are coming to the conclusion that more distant objects are really not there. This argument could lead the hypothesis that galaxies were formed two billion

Rarest Archive

years after the "Big Bang". The light from the quasars taking billions of years to reach us could be telling the story of the early epoch after the Big Bang. The distant quasars could, indeed, be guiding us how to reconstruct the tale of the origin and evolution of the universe, something that has been intriguing mankind for eons. Quasars were still surrounded by layers of mystery, although more than 100 of these distant radio sources had been discovered over the past two decades. These distant fast moving bodies had been so far identified with X-ray observations as they emit X-rays. They are not detected optically and about 30 to 40 per cent of the diffused X-rays found in the galaxies are supposed to be due to X-rays emitted from quasars. Prof. Martin Rees, of the Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge, states that the radiation energy of a quasar is derived from the gravitational potential energy associated with a supermassive and highly compact object, which could be a "Black Hole". He is of the opinion that these radio objects could also be used to predict the later stages of galaxy formation and as probables of the nature of the dark matter which occupies a largo part of the universe.

Of late, astronomers have discovered strong evidence that many galaxies — including our own "Milky Way" — might have been once quasars, huge objects that once produced the light of billions of suns. They say that quasars, located up to 10 billion light years from earth, produced an intense brilliant glow during the universe's infancy by sucking in enormous quantities of surrounding gas and dust, which were heated to incandescence by being squeezed in the gravity of an

Rarest Archive

immense central Black Hole. Some astronomers theorize that since quasars seem to have vanished long ago, they used up this fuel and bagan producing a waning light, eventually evolving into normal galaxies. Many, if not most, of these galaxies could be dead quasars, but the spectral lines of the light from the galaxies may just be too weak for us to see. Detecting these quasars-like emissions is like trying to see stars in the daytime on earth. They are of the opinion that we cannot examine our own galaxy, i. e. Milky Way, because the centre is obscured by clouds of gas and dust, but if our galaxy was once a quasar, it was a rather modest one containing a Black Hole with a mass of only about five million suns.

Astropyhsicists at the University of California, U. S. A., have reported strong new evidence that massive "Black Hole" exists in the centre of our Milky Way galaxy, surrounded by a cavity 96 trillion kms. wide. The team, which includes the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Charles H. Townes, made a key discovery that gases at the inner edge of the gaseous ring at the galaxy's nucleus swirl at a faster rate than gases farther away, indicating that the gases surround a single massive object. Calculations by the team showed that the invisible matter in the Hole is compressed so tightly by its gravity that its mass must be four million times greater than that of the Sun. So dense is the centre of the Black Hole that neither light nor any other form of radiation can escape. Gases at the inner edge reach speeds of 4,02,000 kms. per hour to 6,92,000 kms. per hour, according to these astrophysicists, and are surrounded by a huge cavity of low

Rarest Archive

density gas. Inside this cavity — 10 light years or about 60 trillion miles across — is a cluster of stars. Beyond the cavity is another swirling circle of hotter, glowing gases Mr. Townes says: "It is now clear that the distribution of mass in the galactic centre is most unusual. With this new evidence the case for a Black Hole now seems quite convincing. Of course, we must all continue to examine it. The orbits of the gases indicate that the Black Hole sucked in enormous quantities of gases in the past million years, and this huge collapse of gas triggered a Super Nova -size explosion in the Black Hole, producing a cavity detected around the galaxy's centre". (A Black Hole is a collapsed star so dense that not even light rays can escape its gravitational pull. Thus, it is not visible and its existence can only be inferred from its effects on objects around it).

The recently proposed "Super Symmetric String Theory", which predicts the existence of a "Shadow Universe", can be tested through the cosmic phenomenon of gravitational lensing, according to Prof. B. P. Burke, of the U. S. National Radio Astronomy Observatory. This extra-ordinary phenomenon of gravitational lensing, in which galaxies themselves act as lenses, was an important astrophysical and cosmological tool which could be used to study a number of heavenly happenings, including the new theory which predicts the existence of a new universe. Prof. Burke recently stated here in Bangalore about the detection of a new case of gravitational lensing in which two images of a single quasar had been recorded. With this case of double imaging of a quasar, he said, the

Rarest Archive

total number of such known lenses in the cosmos had gone up to seven. Three cases were detected through radio telescopes and the rest by optical means. Prof. Burke said the total number of such 'cosmic lenses, could be around 1000 or so, keeping in mind the large number of quasars discovered so far. He said ; "But to detect all such lenses would take a lot of time." Explaining the phenomenon, Prof. Burke said that several quasars had turned out to provide good demonstrations of lensing caused by bending of• the light or radio waves from distant quasars as it passed close to an intervening object such as a galaxy. Predicted by Einstein's Theory of Gravity, the lensing effect could be a test of the fundamental parameters of the universe. The images received depended on the type of lens, i. e. the size and structure of the galaxies.

In an enlightening article — "Gravity : Is it the clue to creation ?" — Eugene Mallove writes : Gravity always has appeared the odd-force-out in physics. It is strong enough over large distances to organize the world of planets, stars and galaxies. Yet it is phenomenally weaker than other forces. In the microcosm of atoms and subatomic particles, gravity plays no perceptible role. Today there is a revolution brewing in physical theory that is totally changing our understanding of how gravity works, how mechanistically the earth keeps the moon in its orbit. This theory also fits gravity into the other mysterious forces of Nature. This "Unified Field Theory" is the "Holy Grail" of physics. Einstein died still seeking it. Some of the fundamental forces have already been unified in the

Rarest Archive

last decade, and it appears that the last force to fall in line will be gravity. Theoretical physicists are hard at work on a theory of "Quantum Gravity" called the 'Superforce" by physicist Paul Davies, who writes in his book with that title that for the first time in history we have within our grasp a complete scientific theory of the whole universe in which no physical object or system lies outside a small set of scientific principles. All the mysterious subatomic particles will live in its framework and interact with each other according to well-defined rules. The "Superforce" is not an extra-strong force. It is a theory that would relate gravity to the rest of nature in a comprehensive mathematically stated law, as elegantly as Einstein's $E-MC^2$ expresses the relationship between energy and mass. The four fundamental forces become aspects of one force and this unified force we call the "Superforce". In Superforce theories the very fabric of space and time acquires a complex structure far beyond our normal apprehensions of space as uniform emptiness. Physicists working on the Superforce speak seriously of the universe having eleven dimensions. The three space dimensions of length, breadth and height that we are aware of, time and then seven more space dimensions. They say we are normally unaware of the other dimensions because they manifest themselves only to a small extent, and then only in the world of subatomic particles.

The Superforce also connects with new thinking about the origin of the universe that describes the first moments of time and space 100 billion to 20

Rarest Archive

billion years ago at the start of the "Big Bang", which created space and time. Summarizing the profound new direction of physics, Davies states — "The world, it seems, can be built more or less of structured nothingness. Force and matter are manifestations of space and time. If true, it is a connection of deepest significance." Gravity was the first force of Nature to come under scientific scrutiny back in the 17th century. Our entire scientific and technological age was ignited by the study of the motion of bodies under its influence. Ascribing mathematically precise laws to the inner workings of Nature was a revolutionary concept essential to technological development. But the road to success was not easy. Galileo needed the courage to challenge the Aristotelian view that heavier bodies fall faster than lighter ones. In establishing Aristotle's error by proving that all bodies accelerate towards the ground identically, Galileo started a path that Newton and then Einstein pursued with a vengeance.

Issac Newton, a sickly ninth child born in the year Galileo died, 1642, was a 23-year-old college student escaping to the countryside to avoid the bubonic plague. In that interlude, Newton formulated his law of universal gravitation — all objects exert gravitational attraction on each other. The pull of gravity between two objects increases the closer they are. And if one object comes twice as close to another, the attraction is not doubled, but squared. It was astounding to be able to describe the motion of heavenly bodies with rules that would also govern small objects. This sufficed for centuries to describe

Rarest Archiver

accurately the course of planets and their moons, the tides and the fall of apples to the ground.

In 1916, Einstein in his Theory of General Relativity further revealed that this mysterious force of gravity even acted on light. In a famous 1919 eclipse observation, it was confirmed that a star's light would curve a predicted amount as it passed near our Sun. Einstein explained gravity as the curvature of four-dimensional space-time continuum caused by matter. But the question which science is still wrestling with is — "How does this happen?" We can describe in great detail the electrical forces that make a radio work. We still have only the vaguest idea, however, by exactly what mechanism the Sun holds the earth in its orbit. The latest thinking is that all matter emits particles of force called gravitons and gravitinos that go out in the universe and create the effects that we understand as gravity. It is the answer to this question — "How, machanistically, does gravity work?" — that may finally unlock the riddles of all the forces in the universe, and how space and time were created in the "Big Bang".

The modern history of making the forces that control nature fit together starts with the 19th century notion that electromagnetic waves, such as sunlight, travelled through an invisible medium in space called "The Ether", much the way sound travels through air. The trouble with that theory turned out to be that, unlike sound, the speed of light is unnervingly constant for all observers, no matter how fast

Rarest Archive

they were travelling toward the source of that light. Einstein resolved the paradox by dispensing with the ether and formulating an intimate relation between space and time — his Theory of Special Relativity. Commonsense notions of time became extinct. "Now" for us here on earth is not the same as "Now" in a speding spaceship. The flow of time was inextricably connected with space. Events occurred in a four dimensional space-time rather than in space alone. At about the same time, the notion of the atom being a hard billiard ball had been dealt blows by accumulating contradictory evidence. It began to show the structure of an electrically charged nucleus surrounded by electrons. A new theory of "Quantum Mechanics" had to be developed to explain atomic phenomena. In quantum mechanics, light, for example, could have dual attributes of particle and wave. It also does not behave according to cause-and-effect rules. Rather, its behaviour is described by the laws of statistics. Subatomic particles, which are also covered by quantum mechanics, make transitions in their states of motion, position, spin etc. that are impossible to predict. (This is called "The Principle of Uncertainty" by the particle physicists.). They behave unlike anything in the real world. The probability of occurrence of a behaviour can be computed with great precision, but the exact time, location, form etc. of the behaviour cannot be predicted.

Quantum mechanics, in esseace, tells us that at the subatomic level "things just happen, and don't ask why?" In quantum machanics, scientists are confronted with physical behaviour that they have to

Rarest Archive

admit exists, but that to the average person just seems to make no sense. Events occur that have no observable cause ; particles appear to act on each other instantaneously over vast distances. Some of these particles — by the definitions in the theories that scientists have been forced to create — will never be detectable no matter what our technology, because they exist in a zone of uncertainty where no conceivable detection experiment will ever be able to get into. This capriciousness continues to shake our world view. Einstein, though a major contributor to the development of quantum mechanics, refused to believe that— "God plays dice with the universe". Today we know that 'God does play'. As a theory, Relativity is simple and elegant. Quantum mechanics, in contrast, is so bizarre that one physicist claimed — 'Anybody who says he understands quantum mechanics doesn't". Yet quantum mechanics is essential to modern techrology, from semiconductors to biochemistry. And it now appears that it is central to our understanding of gravity. A pioneering theory of quantum mechanics has been developed to explain why one negatively charged electron will repel another negatively charged electron much as the south pole of a magnet will repel the south pole of another magnet. The theory is that electrons give off "exchange particles" that actually reach out and repel the other electrons at a distance. In the case of electrons these "exchange particles" that do the repelling are called 'Photons', and these photons, in turn, are merely visible light. In this example there are two kinds of particles — the electron and the photon that it throws off. The electron is the kind of particle that theorists think of as being associated with matter, while the

Rarest Archiver

photon is the kind of particle that they think of as being mainly a force carrier. All kinds of particles that belong to the 'Mass-Y' general class are lumped together as "Fermions". All kinds of particles that are mainly force carriers are lumped together as "Bosons" Now, as it turns out, electro-magnetism is not the only force that can be explained ,as the action of particles on one another. Two more of the "Big Four" forces in the universe, the strong nuclear force, responsible for holding the atomic nucleus together, and the weak nuclear force, responsible for the decay of some particles, can also be explained in this particle mode. They too are manifestations of "Mass-Y" fermion particles emitting mainly force-carrying "Boson" particles, which actually produce the results that we understand as basic forces. So exchange particles appear to explain electromagnetic force and the two nuclear forces, but until recently there was no corresponding exchange particle for the last of the major forces in the universe - gravity. Here is where quantum mechanics begins to fit into our understanding of the "Big Bang" that started the universe. Until now, "unifying" these forces has meant that we understand them in basically the same way. As a result of particles that were discovered at the powerful European Cern Nuclear Accelerator in 1983, researchers now began to think that at the earliest instant of the Big Bang these forces were literally unified. The electromagnetic and the weak force really were the same force. Only one kind of force existed between particles at that time. This was all before the first trillionth of a second of time, when temperatures were 1,000 trillion degrees above absolute zero. As the universe rapidly expanded

Rarest Archive

it cooled. Apparently, at these lower energy levels the forces came to acquire their specialization in order to perform the functions they now do. Now there has also been a conjectured unification of the strong nuclear force with the electro-weak force in the so-called "Grand Unification Theories" or GUTs. If these theories are valid, they produce a prediction that all protons in the universe will ultimately decay. Thus, to check the theory scientists have been hard at work to detect the extremely rare decay of the proton. Some believe that evidence of "proton decay" has been found already at the Kolar Gold Mines and at two other research centres in Italy and Japan. If this force-unification were ever literally true — if all four fundamental forces, including gravity, were once really one or unified — it would have been earlier than the Big Bang; it would have been an almost inconceivable one-ten-million-trillionth of trillionth.

So now scientists think that they have three of the four major forces brought into one fold, both conceptually and possibly literally. Only gravity is still the odd pace force out. If someone could make gravity fit, into a new theory, he or she would explain the "Superforce". Theorists since the early 1970s have been trying to find a way to express the mechanism of gravity in quantum mechanical terms. In short, the question is — "Are there particles of gravity? And if so, how exactly do they work on one another?" The brilliant British physicist, Stephen Hawking, is one who believes that a complete Superforce theory will soon be at hand that will be able to explain all of Nature. The particles for gravity are

Rarest Archive

designated the "graviton" and the "gravitino" by physicists. Yet the pendulum of physics is swinging again, bringing in new geometries of higher dimensional space, to explain the particle interactions of the Superforce. In particular, a five-dimensional space-time geometry, developed by Kaluza and Klein in the 1920s to tie gravity and electromagnetism together is now being dusted off to understand the Superforce. By adding sevan space dimensions to four - dimensional space–time continuum, physicists have been able to describe their menagerie of particles as the "curling of space-time" at incredibly small scales. We are unaware of these added dimensions because their manifestations are far too small to observe.

Down at dimensions a billion trillion times smaller than that of an atomic nucleus, space has a foam-like structure, according to this theory Gravitational theorist Bryce Dewitt writes that — "An observer who attempts to penetrate the fourth spatial dimension is almost instantly back where he started. Indeed, it is meaningless to speak of such an attempt, because the very atoms of which the observer is composed are larger than the cylindrical circumference (of the fourth dimension) The fourth dimension is simple, unobservable as such." Our notions of space and time are sorely tested by quantum machanic attempts to explain the Superforce. Bryce Dewitt writes — "In a universe governed by quantum gravity, the curvature of space-time and even its very structure would be subject to fluctuations. Indeed, it is possible that the sequence of events in the world and the meaning of the past and the future would

Rarest Archiver

be susceptible to change." Paul Davies writes — "The orderly arrangement of points, the smooth continuity of the space of classical geometry disappears in the froth of space-time. Instead we have a melee of half-existing ghost spaces all jumbled together In this chaotic shifting sea, the common-sense notion of 'place' fades completely away." If the Superforce seems remarkable to us, it has also put many physicists in awe. The final numbing suggestion it offers involves mass-related 'furmion' particles giving off the force-related 'boson' particles. The physicists thought that nothing could be more fundamentally different in their behaviour. Yet now it is suspected that if we gain an understanding of the Superforce, these two radically different classes of particles might be tied together by an underlying symmetry rule.

The Superforce may not be the last important development in gravity research, though it might well be the final theory. Might we get control over gravity someday, much as we have mastered electromagnetism? Physicist Robert Forward has speculated that it might be possible to communicate via ripples in space gravity waves. Now the prospect seems remote, because high densities of matter moving at near-light velocity would have to be obtained to make gravity - wave transmitters. But gravity-waves could penetrate the solid body of a planet with ease. Forward has suggested that tiny Black Holes left over from the origin of the universe might hover in the cores of planets and asteroids. If we could mine asteroids from them, electrically charge them and move them around, we might have a source of high density mass for future gravitational engineering projects What about anti-gravity? According to Robert

Rarest Archive

Forward, there are at least three ways of getting anti-gravity through known physical laws, and other potential ways through speculative extensions of physics Unfortunately, anti-gravity would be a costly proposition. requiring exceedingly high density materials (the density of some dwarf stars). If we could fashion a very dense flat slab of material and support it on super strong pillars (say, made of diamond?), the region beneath the slab would have a near-zero gravity field due to the cancellation of earth's gravity by the upward pull of the slap. This Newtonian anti-gravity machine might not be very practical (except for amusement parks) but Newton himself could have conceived it. Forward has also described dense twisting doughnuts of mass and other configurations that would give rise to anti-gravity fields allowed by special and general relativity. Whether humanity could ever harness these stupendous machines for space flight or other purposes is an open question. Gravity was once the dusty curiosity of high school physical labs with their inclined planes, spring scales and stop watches. It now appears that science has came full swing to view gravity as the central creative force in the universe. We knew that gravity stoked the fusion fires of stars, that it made planets and moons round and that it plotted the course of galaxies But we did not suspect that an enlarged view of gravity would be the key to all physics and the origin of all things.

Physics And Cosmology

Yet physicists seem never to reach any finality

Rarest Archive

and declare that 'this alone is the Absolute or Ultimate Reality' Recently physicists in the U. S. A. have once again speculated about the existence of a fifth force at work in the universe. These scientists have carried out a new analysis of data presented by a Hungarian scientist way back in 1922. "Hypercharge" — as the new force is called — opposes gravity and depends on the nature and composition of the falling object, thus contradicting Galileo's 17th century principle that all falling bodies accelerate at the same rate. The team of physicists who re-examined the 60-year old data published their findings recently in the journal — "Physical Review Letters". Though the force also challenges Einstein's principle of equivalence, a part of the General Theory of Relativity, it is believed that "Hypercharge" is weak enough not to fundamentally alter Einstein's theory. The fifth force is postulated to be 100 times weaker than gravity and acts within a distance of about 200 metres. Such a force will not have any discernible effect on planetary motion at all. Commenting on the findings of the study, Dr. Ephraim Fischbach, Professor of Physics at Purdue University and leader of the team of physicists which conducted the study, said — "When you see something as fundamental as a new force, it is likely to change many things. We will have to rethink many views of particle physics and cosmology," according to reports by "New York Times".

The fate of the universe may be to continue expanding forever. This is the conclusion, reported to an international scientific coneference at Honolulu recently, of new evidence on one of the cosmology's most fundamental questions. Eternal expansion on what

Rarest Archive

scientists call an "Open Universe" is one of the two alternatives that cosmologists have debated for decades. The other — "Closed Universe" — is that the universe's present expansion will gradually slow and reverse into a contraction. Eventually, the contraction would compress all matter back into a small space. The "Big Bang" the theory that the universe was sent scattering in one massive explosion, therefore, would lead to what has been dubbed "Big Crunch". The deciding factor is whether there is enough matter in the universe to produce enough collective gravitational pull to slow and reverse the expansion. Many cosmologists find a "Big Crunch" philosophically satisfying because it would be easy to envision a crunched universe rebounding into a new Big Bang. In this view, the universe repeatedly renews itself. But if the galaxies simply keep racing apart, a time will come when all the stars die, leaving a universe of 'lifeless cinders' that grows steadily emptier. The report does not settle the question, but it does lend weight to the belief in an "Open Universe". The evidence was developed by Victor E. Viola, an Indiana University chemist, and reported to the International Chemical Congress of Pacific Basin Societies, a meeting of scientists from the United States, Japan, Canada, and 35 other countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. Viola's findings are based on theories of how each of the chemical elements was formed. The simplest elements - hydrogen, helium and one isotope of lithium — are believed to have originated in the first moments of the Big Bang as he energy of the primordial fireball condensed into protons, neutrons, electrons and other subatomic particles. None of the other elements could form until more than a million years later, after

Rarest Archive

the formation of stars, whose nuclear reactions rearranged subatomic particles, welding them into heavier elements including those necessary for life. Mr. Viola told the meeting — "There is one element, however, an isotope of Lithium, that we think is too fragile to have been formed in stars or in any other process we can think of, except in the Big Bang. This is Lithium-7, the amount of which in the universe will depend on the amount of matter present in the Big Bang at the stage at which Lithium-7 was formed. We think we nave a pretty good handle on the cosmic abundance of Lithium-7 and from that we think we can estimate the baryon density of the primordial fireball." Baryons are the heavy subatomic particles like protons and neutrons and they account for nearly all the known mass of the universe. Mr. Viola stated; "Our calculations show that to produce the amount of Lithium-7 in the universe there can only have been about nine per cent of the mass in the form of baryons, necessary to close the universe". In other words, the universe appears to have less than one-tenth the mass needed to produce enough gravity to halt the current expansion.

There is, however, one unresolved question about the mass of the universe. Its answer could reverse the conclusion. This is; "Whether a mysterious particle called the 'neutrino' has mass, and if so, how much ?" Neutrinos are unusually tiny particles with no electrical charge and they fly through space in all directions. The universe is awash in neutrinos, billions of them penetrating every human body every second. Because they are so small, they almost pass completely through the

Rarest Archive

earth without touching any other particle. For many years it was believed that neutrinos have no mass at all. Recently, however, some physicists have reported that neutrinos may have a very small mass compared with other particles. The evidence is preliminary, but if their mass is large enough, there are so many neutrinos that they could provide enough mass to 'close the universe'. Until the mass of the neutrino is established, however, the report of the Honolulu meeting corroborates evidence from other lines of inquiry that the universe has but one life. — "The Washington Post".

Some astrophysicists say that a quirk of physics probably brought about the creation of earth and sky and the eventual evolvement of man. In the beginning of the universe before the original "Big Bang" some 15 to 20 billion years ago, there were equal amounts of matter and anti-matter. Dortmund physicist Professor Konrad Kleinknecth, who led a recent international meeting of scientists at Nordkirchen Castle near this West German city of Dortmund, said: "Yet now there is no proof that anti-matter exists, despite the most intensive searches. We do not know what happened to it. The fact is that there is no evidence at all that any of the estimated 100 billion galaxies out in space consists of anti-matter." If matter exists, then so should its opposite. This means that a sort of 'killer radiation' must be somewhere to be found in space. Further, it ought to be possible to find out how this comes into being, and to establish such phenomena as when negative-charged electrons impact

Rarest Archive

with their equally heavy but opposite - charged "brothers". It was Soviet scientist Andrei Sakharov — now banished to the Soviet city of Gorki — who was one of the first to come up with a possible explanation. In his view, it is an upset in the symmetry between matter and anti-matter which lies behind the existence of what we today call the Milky Way, the stars, the planets and thus the earth, people, plants and animals. Astrophysicists tend nowadays to the view that there is no anti-matter at all to be found in space. Prof. Kleinknecth says: "Probably, only a billionth of the matter still exists which was produced in the original Big Bang." It could be that, as a result of small irregularities in the density of matter — and in the last analysis as a result of pure accident — that matter and anti-matter were not mutually destroyed and turned into radiation. Latest research has further shown that cosmic background radiation — proved as supplying "fingerprints" of the original Big Bang — is much more evenly spread than originally presumed. This in turn leads to the assumption that matter released in the Big Bang was spread in a reasonably even way — but unstable, says Prof. Kleinknecth. These surprising results would seem to back the conclusion that the neutrinos, which are dispersed throughout space in great numbers, form sufficient mass to stop space from expanding. This in turn means the universe would one day collapse like a balloon suddenly losing its air and would be obliterated — perhapsto be born anew.

In the 1920s an international group of physicists, including Niels Bohr from Denmark, Louis de Broglie

Rarest Archive

from France, Erwin Schroedinger and Wolfgang Pauli from Austria, Werner Heisenberg from Germany and Paul Dirac from England, had discovered that the number of electrons in the atoms of an element determine the element's chemical properties, and today we know that the whole periodic table of elements can be built up by successively adding protons and neutrons to the nucleus of the lightest atom, viz. hydrogen, and the corresponding number of electrons to its "atomic shell" The interactions between the atoms give rise to the various chemical processes, so that all of chemistry can now in principle be understood on the basis of the laws of atomic physics. Dirac and Schroedinger are, in fact, the founders of quantum mechanics. Dirac has also enhanced our understanding of the subatomic world, and it is a strange world of particles and antiparticles, according to him. It was from his mathematical study of the micro-world of atoms that he was led to the belief that each particle must have a corresponding anti-particle. His theory was supported by the findings of the American scientist, Carl David Anderson, in the course of his research in cosmic rays. Anderson called the anti-electron "positron". The concept of "mutual annihilation" emerged later — that is of the electron and the positron combining and in the process leaving no matter but only energy. The idea of anti-particles has had fascinating developments, as it was extended to anti-matter and an anti-universe. All this has deepened our knowledge and understanding of nature, but paradoxically, at the same time, it has led to the opposite view — that nature can never be fully understood. Dirac himself believed that one is guided by Intuition rather than by

Rarest Archive

an exact knowledge of facts. According to him, natural phenomena are too complex to be spelt out with precision. Hence his view of Reality comprehended only as an "approximation". In this he comes close to Heisenbergiah philosophy.

The age-old tradition of explaining complex structures by breaking them down into simpler constituents is so deeply ingrained in Western thought that the search for these basic components is still going on. There is, however, a radically different school of thought in particle physics which starts from the idea that nature cannot be reduced to fundamental entities, such elementary particles or fundamental fields. It has to be understood entirely through its self-consistency, with its components being consistent both with one another and with themselves. This idea was first mooted in the "S-matrix theory" — the letter S standing for 'scattering' which refers to collision or 'scattering' processes or the majority of particle reactions — in 1943. Later on this "S-matrix theory" has been supplemented by another theory called "Bootstrap theory", originated by Geoffrey Chew, who has developed the idea into a general "bootstrap" philosophy of nature, which constitutes the final rejection of the mechanistic world view in modern physics. Quite contrary to the Newtonian mechanistic world view, this bootstrap hypothesis envisages explicitly that the world cannot be understood as an "assemblage of entities" which cannot be analysed further. In the new world view, the universe is seen as a 'dynamic web' of interrelated events. None of the properties

Rarest Archive

of any part of this web is fundamental; they all follow from the properties of the other parts, and the overall consistency of their mutual interrelations determines the structure of the entire web.

The renowned Indian astrophysicist, Prof. Jayant V. Narlikar, recently at the 10th annual meeting of the Astronomical Society of India at Bombay, was of the viewpoint that—"After all, the universe might have had no beginning at all." In his presidential address on — "The very early universe — problems and prospects" — Prof. Narlikar said that a universe without a beginning and without an end was not new to cosmology. Till 1965 the "Steady State theory" offered such an alternative to the "Big Bang theory". His current area of research called "Quantum Cosmology" has now taken up the legacy of the earlier Steady State theory which ruled out the concept of a "beginning" for the universe. The flurry of activity in the study of the very early universe was due to the particle physicists, Prof. Narlikar felt and did not conceal his attack on the particle physicists for their 'inconsistencies'. He stated: "The particle physicists who, as the high priests of physics, had hitherto looked upon cosmology as a somewhat dubious part of physics, suddenly realized that the very early universe offered the only scenario for testing the authenticity of their holy grail, namely, the Grand Unified Theories (GUTS) and the more esoteric ideas about super symmetry (SUSY). So the investigations of the state of the universe were swiftly elevated from speculative parascience to

Rarest Archive

the most fundamental area of theoretical physics." Particle physicists through their Grand Unification theory predicted the existence of many species of subatomic particles called "Neutrinos', and their likely mass ranges. By the same theory, particles of very heavy mass called "Monopoles" were predicted as relics of the early universe. Prof. Narlikar pointed out that these predictions of particle physicists posed certain problems to the present universe. If there were too many species of massive neutrinos that survive to the present day, then they would push up the mass density of the universe to uncomfortable high values. Similarly, the magnetic monopoles were so massive that they could not be destroyed after creation. When particle physicists found too much of these "relics" uncomfortable, they sought to "destroy" them.

Yet another new theory of the universe was propounded by a team of international astronomers. They opine that the universe will go on expanding forever and not end with a Bang. The team's Australian spokesman, Dr. Bruce Peterson, said the universe would eventually become a cold and dark eternity, as all its stars become extinguished after running out of their nuclear fuel. This lightless void would have uniform temperature of about absolute zero. Until now, the more popular theory of the universe has been that the force of gravity would eventually bring a halt to the present expansion of the universe which would result in it beginning to fall back on itself – a process which would end with the "Big Bang", Dr. Peterson said.

Rarest Archive

He said calculations showed that there was not enough matter in the universe for its gravitation to overcome the forces of expansion generated by the Big Bang. This meant that the universe would literally be without end. Dr. Peterson said that long before the universe became a lightless void our planet would have been swallowed up by an expanding Sun.

At the time of going to the press in mid-February 1986, there was still another newspaper report coming in, stating that an American astronomer has suggested that our Milky Way is enveloped in a gigantic cloud of Black Holes. 'The New York Times'' reported recently that the astronomer of Yale University envisions two modes of star formation, one of which, early in the history of the galaxy, produced the giant stars that have now collapsed, forming the hypothetical cloud of Black Hole. Such an invisible halo would account for the gravity that controls otherwise unexplained motions of stars within the Milky Way. Visible material is insufficient to explain them. Similarly, multitudes of Black Holes around other galaxies could explain what keeps clusters of galaxies from flying apart, the astronomer believes. He is of the opinion that star formation is most likely to occur in giant, luminous clouds of hot molecules, such as the one observed in Orion. The life of those giant stars is relatively short and they eventually collapse into Black Holes, believed to be concentrations of matter so dense that not even light can escape. Gas blown off the collapsing stars forms a disc. Within the disc small, cool, dark clouds become abundant and produce smaller stars like the Sun.

Rarest Archive

The US Government is spending $ 130 million and using its space shuttle to see once and for all if Albert Einstein was right when he said gravity can bend time in space. The experiment, conducted by Stanford University researchers, may solve some of the mysteries of the universe and eventually take scientists a step closer to building a spaceship that can travel close to the speed of light. "I consider this the most challenging test we'll undertake in this millennium", said Prof. Frank McDonald, Chief Scientist for NASA. He added : ' For the first time, NASA will have gone out to check one of the fundamental forces in nature. And regardless of the outcome, the test will have enormous applications for technology." The project, which the NASA budget has supported for the past 20 years, is called "Gravity Probe B". It is scheduled to be conducted in an orbiting satellite in 1990, preceded by a 1988 test in the space shuttle. Actually, the experiment will test only a single part of Einstein's general theory of relativity called "Gravitomagnetism". That part of the theory predicts that moving masses, like the earth, generate a field of gravity that can distort or "curve" the field of gravity aboard an orbiting space vehicle. If "Gravitomagnetism" is proved, then the scientists will have some evidence that gravity can make time pass at different speeds in space, relative to earth. "To check gravitomagnetism we have built special gyroscopes that work with spinning quartz balls which are believed to be the roundest objects ever made on earth," Stanford physicist Francis Everitt said in a telephone interview from his office in Palo Alto, California.

Rarest Archive

Recently three Indian physicists have proposed an astrophysical method for detection of celestial objects moving with speed greater than that of light. Existence of particles called "Tachyons" moving faster than light had been proposed several years ago but had not been observed. Light travels at 3,00,000 kilometres per second. A method for detecting such objects in space has been proposed by Dr. Alagar Ramanujam of N.G.M. College in Polachi, Dr. G. A. Savariraj of the St. Joseph's College in Tiruchirapalli and Dr. T.S. Shankara of the Indian Institute of Technology in Madras. Reporting their work in the physics journal, "Ramana", they said that tachyonic objects can be detected by the characteristic pattern of radio signals they emit when moving at superluminal velocity. According to the scientists, a tachyonic object in space will give out radio signals that would initially appear to an observer on earth to come from a single source. Immediately after that, the signals would appear to come from two sources. The appearance of a single image of the source, immediately followed by double image for certain time and again a single image, is an indication that the source is moving at a speed faster than light, they stated. According to these scientists, there is speculation that the source of gravitational radiation claimed to have been observed by American scientists in 1970 "might be a dense aggregate of techyonic matter". Developing their theory on the nature of tachyon radiations from first principles, the scientists found that tachyon emissions are cone-shaped. An observer outside the cone first sees a single source and then finds it split into two, they said. According to them, such novel features

Rarest Archive

of radiation from a moving object "do not seem to have been noticed earlier."

From these varied and even contradictory theories put forth by the present-day astrophysicists and cosmologists and by their experiments it is evident that any attempt by the scientist to know the exact nature of physical Reality is thwarted both in the macrocosmic and the microcosmic realms, if these can be absolutely segregated and dissociated at all. Modern nuclear physicists with their high energy particle accelerators are becoming more and more confused and confounded as to what can be called as "elementary" or "fundamental" particles. Most of them consider *particles as "mere manifestations", as Sir Cyril Hensel* Wood puts it, of the strange properties of the space-time continuum. Yet inspite of all these misgivings, confusions, speculations, we find that "the Exclusion Principle", discovered by Wolfgang Pauli, brings in order, system and structure into the subatomic realms of nuclear phenomena by constructing a nucleus with many protons and neutrons as well as building up stable atoms with a central nucleus and peripheral electrons. Inspite of the proliferation of fundamental particles, we find a principle of order and integration giving rise to stable configuration and structures of higher complexity and wholeness. Nuclear physicists may not be able to tell us what is the essential stuff of matter but they cannot deny or refute at the same time the presence of order and harmony in the universe on the basis of which all their so-called theories or models, laws and principles stand and can be sustained. Their analysis of matter has made

Rarest Archive

the solid-looking substantial lumps of matter vanish into ethereal waves of probability and ghostly-looking fields of influence. What our eyes see as matter and what the nuclear physicists say it is — these two are totally different pictures or accounts. According to these subatomic scientists, our senses 'deceive us as to what the physical Reality is and they reveal only the appearances or what are apparently real things'. All said and done, thus the investigators of physical sciences into the macrocosm through Astrophysics and into the microcosm through Nuclear Physics do not seem to give any insight into the essential and ultimate nature of Physical Reality. At their respective frontiers matter eludes their observation owing to the very laws of the universe Let us now consider Biology, the third and last branch of science which studies matter in its most complex 'living form'.

BIOLOGY AND EVOLUTION

Investigating the most complex organisations of matter, the modern Biological Science has split itself into Biochemistry and Biophysics. Biochemistry deals with the various chemical reactions that are taking place inside a living cell as well as in the entire living organism, whereas Biophysics studies the physical behaviour and structure of the various large molecules which are the constituents of the living

Rarest Archive

cell. These latest Biological studies have brought into focus the fact that the initial constituents of living matter were produced by the action of ultra-violet light and electric discharges on earth's ammonia, methane and water vapour-rich atmosphere about three billion years ago. The resultant amino acids and other organic compounds further underwent polymerisation to form enzymes, proteins and finally the macromolecules of deoxyribonucleic acid or DNA and ribonucleic acid or RNA. These big complex molecules comprising thousands of atoms of carbon, hydrogen, notrogen. phosphorus etc. somehow organized themselves into an organic unit called "the living cell" in the warm seas of those ancient times. Starting from such unicellular organic structures through specialization and differentiation more complex multi-cellular organisms were formed, following a self-division process. At each stage of this biological evolution higher forms and processes of organization, integration and complexity were developed. These multi-cellular units further evolved following the laws of genetic mutation, differential reproduction and natural selection to become the multifarious creatures, extinct and extant in the universe, culminating in the marvel of creation, i. e. the homo sapien or modern man, who is described as the most complex, highly integrated and organized formulation in the universe. Thus man, the dominant species of this planet, i. e. earth, today occupies the pinnacle in the order of evolution and is "ruling over the forces of Nature". The insentient and inert matter has transcended its inherent limits and has achieved

Rarest Archive

its consummate fulfilment and glory as a Self-conscious and sentient whole.

The two major 19th century developments in biology were Darwin's theory of natural selection and Mendel's laws of heredity. Darwin explained how various species came into being, while Mendel showed how hereditary characters got transmitted from one generation to the other. Early in the 20th century biologists identified a substance called deoxyribo nucleic acid going under the popular name of DNA, which appeared to be the repository of genetic information. It is explained by biologists that the DNA from parents got "replicated" in children, thereby passing on hereditary characteristics and tendencies. In the 50s James Watson and Francis Crick proposed the famous "double helix" structure for DNA which explained the process of genetic replication, or in simple words, how the parent DNA or gene became the child DNA or gene. Detailed study of the deoxyribonucleic acid has revealed that its molecules consist of amino acids, two sets of bases known as "purine bases" and "pyrimidine bases" and a sugar known as 'deoxyribose" A base is chemically similar to an alkali. Every organism, from the smallest bacterium to the most complex human being, starts its life as a single-cell and through various chemical processes this unitary cell splits, except in single-celled bacteria, and various organs, like the limbs, ears and eyes etc. develop. The DNA contains all the basic information about all this development. Every phase of development of the organism depends upon the synthesis of a particular protein. These proteins are complex substances abundant

Rarest Archiver

and widely distributed in all living organisms and they occur as very large molecules comprising hundreds or thousands of amino acid units. Determination of the problem as to how the required proteins are synthesized at the precise time will lead the biologists to the secrets of "gene expression" or hereditary traits. Research in molecular biology at present focusses on two major aspects, viz. the problem of protein synthesis as related to gene expression and finding out the base sequence of different types of DNA. However, there is one big problem confronting biologists and that is called "morphogenesis", which is about how organs like the limbs, eyes and ears develop. Recently in the 80s Rupert Sheldrake proposed a new theory to explain morphogenesis, which states that the first time a new organ or, for that matter even a new crystal, is developed it has a range of options before it, limited only by thermodynamic considerations. According to the laws of thermodynamics, a form which consumes less energy is more likely to materialize than a form that consumes more energy. For a limb or a crystal there might be several possible forms of roughly similar energies. Which form the limb assumes the first time around could be a matter of chance. However, once the first form is fully developed, as in the case of a human arm or leg, all future human arms and legs are "more likely' to assume this form than any other form. This principle is called the principle of "formative causation".

Modern science used the concept of field" to explain how certain impulses are transmitted. The propagation of electromagnetic waves, normal light

Rarest Archive

waves, for example, requires an electromagnetic field. Similarly, to transmit the influence of formative causation, Sheldrake postulates the existence of what he calls "morphogenetic fields". This theory explains morphogenesis by referring to already existing forms and, therefore, escapes the complexities that any protein synthesis – based explanation must necessarily involve. Thousands of proteins must be synthesized in a precise sequence and the parts of DNA or genes that control this sequence must switch 'on' and 'off' with incredible accuracy. However, many mainstream scientists do not accept Sheldrake's ideas, though Sheldrake has cast them in a 'falsifiable' form, i.e. a form that is capable of being tested experimentally. The problem of morphogenesis, then, is likely to be unresolved in the next two decades, despite many experiments based on his ideas being carried out to find out the veracity of his theories. In fact, in a recent issue of the "New Scientist" Sheldrake has reported on some new experiments which appear to lend cautious support to the idea of formative causation, More experiments are being devised which can test Sheldrake's hypotheses. If these gain support, a revolution would be in the making not only in biology but in all other sciences where the question of form is a major one, for example, crystallography.

There is much more that is happening in biology, especially in the area known as genetic engineering, or more technically, recombinant DNA research. In this a portion of DNA with some desirable property (say, the ability to synthesize insulin) is cut and introduced into the DNA of some organism, usually *Escherichia coli*,

Rarest Archiver

a single-celled organism that occupies the human gut. *Escherichia coli* then can also sythesize insulin, something it cannot usually do. In this field, technique has developed very fast, though there are as yet undetermined dangers arising from unrestrained use of the techniques. Recombinant DNA research would continue to be a major field of research endeavour for many years to come, but the emphasis is more likely to be on the technology side than on the pure science side.

"Nedelya", the weekly supplement of Izvestia says in one of its recent issue that heredity is the mojor longevity factor. The weekly quotes a study of 40,000 long livers (80 years and over) and their relatives made by the Institute of Gerontology at Kiev. The study covered the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic in Soviet Georgia, and Hunza in Kashmir and Vilkabamba in the Andes mountains of Equador. Scientists do not know yet a gene that confers longlife but have found that longlivers do not have the harmful genes which increase the danger of contracting diseases which shorten life, according to Nedelya. Soviet gerontologists believe that long life is programmed in the hereditary apparatus. The Kiev study covers families with longlivers in successive generations and seeks to answer the question whether long life is transferred from generation to generation by the father or the mother. Researchers have discovered a rare bacterium which may be a living fossil from the beginning of photosynthesis, the process by which plants convert sunlight into oxygen and make life on earth possible. Scientists at Indiana University in Bloomington say the bacterium may play

Rarest Archive

a key role in understanding how the process of photosynthesis evolved billions of years ago when earth was a young oxygen-poor planet. In a report recently to the National Science Foundation, which sponsored the research, Dr. Howard Gest and Research assistant Jaffrey Favinger said the bacterium has properties never before seen.

Scientists have become so familiar with the fine structure of living cells that their manipulation and culture now appear commonplace. Intact chromosomes can be lifted out of cells for genetic studies. Plant protoplasts (cells devoid of their cell walls) can be made to grow into whole plants and much has been learned of plant metabolism by grafting experiments - for example, the grafting of tomato tops to potato tubers demonstrated the energy storing capacity of tubers, although the hybrid was of little practical value. Hybrids of potato and tomato cells have also been grown and are called "pomatoes" fancifully and not "totatoes" as one scientist humorously remarked. But perhaps the most exciting development has been in the sophistication of techniques used to create novel hybrid cells from two or more different cell types. One example of this has been the production of specific antibodies (monoclonals) made by fusing tumour cells and lymphocytes. Now Barry Mac Donald and William Wimpery, of the Department of Biology at the University of Hamburg, have taken this research to its logical conclusion by creating the first hybrid from a plant and animal cell. Placing an electrode into the culture medium and delivering an extremely short burst of current (a matter of nono-

Rarest Archive

seconds) they found that the two different cell types fused together in pairs if the electrodes were immersed in the solution long enough. The medium contains a high concentration of long chain poly saturated fats, similar to those found in some natural vegetable products. Cell pairs were removed and incubated in a warm (40 degrees Centigrade) oven By experimenting with the duration of incubation they found that fusion occurred after only a few hours and that viable hybrids could be grown in a liquid culture medium containing glucose monodium glutamate, a mixture of vitamins, sodium chloride and extracts of *Rephanus brassica* (common mustard). Using these techniques Mac Donald and Wimpery have used fused cells of *Lycopersicon esculentum* with cells of *Bostourus.* The resulting hybrid grows like its tomato parent but develops a tough leathery skin. Field trials have shown that the mature "plant" has an otherwise normal foliage, although its flowers are pollinated only by horseflies. Attempts are now being made by the authors to cross these hybrids with wheat cells hopefully to produce a wheat - tomato - cow - super - hybrid. Whether or not the fruits of such a hybrid could be commercially exploited is not yet clear. However, Mac Donald and Wimpery feel that they are on to something very exciting.

An Australian medical team has developed a hormone which can increase animal production by 25 to 30 per cent and, in some cases, by as much as 70 per cent. The team headed by Dr. Bob Seamark and Dr. David Kennanay of the University of Adelaide's Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, "found that

Rarest Archive

chemical compounds in the pineal glands of sheep differed according to the time of the year," and that this difference was occasioned largely by how the animals viewed sensonal light. As autumn approached and days shortened, autumn-breeding sheep responded by producing a substance called melatonin, which triggered the mechanism in their bodies to prepare them for mating, an Australian Information Service release says. The scientists found that the use of synthetically-produced melatonin could cause sheep to breed whenever they wanted. Scientists have identified a viral gene which implanted in bacteria can significantly increase production of bio-medical products including interferon, a protein produced by animal cells which gives some protection against virus attack and its protective action is believed to be through its effect on the host cells rather than directly on the virus. The gene, implanted by a team of scientists at Retgers University in the United States, has resulted in an eightfold increase in the production of interferon and other important medical products. Dr. Lee Simon, microbiologist in charge of the project, says that several years ago he discovered that the T-4 Virus, which infects only bacteria, can prevent bacteria from destroying proteins. These proteins constitute 85 per cent of biomedical products, but there was a problem that within 30 minutes a T-4 Virus can destroy a bacteria. Dr Simon says: "The task, then, was to isolate the portion of the virus that stabilises, and thus preserve genetically engineered proteins." It took almost two years to find the correct gene. "We shotgunned it," he says describing the way his team took part in finding the virus's NDA and tediously tested segment after segment.

Rarest Archiver

"Science Digest", quoting Dr. Simon, says the resulting gene, called the Pin Gene (because it inhibits proteolysis or protein breakdown) was then inserted into the common bacterium, *Escherichia Coli*, along with the gene for interferon. "The results were striking and very consistent," says Dr. Simon. Bacteria with the viral gene outproduced those without it by a wide margin. Similar results have been obtained with bacteria bio-engineered to produce other substances. The only problem now is that viral gene seems to slow the growth rate of bacterial colonies.

The Governmental Institute of Physical and Chemical Research in Tokyo has announced the discovery of a new gene that effectively extracts such proteins as growth hormones and interferon from *Colon Bacilli*, produced through gene-splicing technology. *Colon Bacilli*, intensively used in biotechnological production of cancer-fighting interferon and other substances, allow extraction of a marginal amount of the proteins, but the Institute scientists said extraction of the proteins from *Colon Bacilli* becomes much easier with the help of the new gene and thus contributes greatly to industrialization of biotechnology, "Kyodo" reports.

Dr. Andrew Murray, a Harvard Medical School-researcher, said recently that he and Dr. Jack W. Szostak, his colleague, had created the first man-made chromosomes, the genetic material that passes Parents' traits to offspring and can be used to identify

Rarest Archive

birth defects. The researchers said the chromosomes could be used in basic applications, but warned that its use in human genetic research was still limited. A Belgium company says it has made a breakthrough in genetic engineering that can help plants to protect themselves against harmful insects by producing their own pesticides. Mare Zabean, a director of plant genetic system, said that the company researchers had implanted a gene of bacterial origin into tobacco plant cells. Afterwards, the plant was found to produce *Bacillus Thuringiensis* proteins — acids long used in biological pesticide sprays. He said: "This provides the potential for the plants to defend themselves against destructive insects."

Thirty-six-year-old Indian scientist Dr. V. Prabhakar Choudhary, who hails from Guntur in Andhra Pradesh, and his four American colleagues working in the US have succeeded in cloning the gene for the enzyme whose deficiency causes Gaucher's disease, the most common Jewish genetic disorder. The cloning of the gene for *Glococerebrosidase*, an enzyme that helps regulate fat within a cell, is considered a big step forward towards improved diagnosis and understanding of this neurological disorder which affects some 20,000 Americans. The method used to find the genetic information for Gaucher's is also applicable to other disorders and the breakthrough in this field may lead to locating defective genes that cause up to 300 disorders, says a research paper on the subject. The scientists say that the cloning of the gene may offer within a decade a

Rarest Archive

cure for the disease by either changing or replacing the defective gene in the cells of its victims.

Another Indian Dr. H. K. Jain, Director of Indian Agricultural Research Institute, has warned that misuse of genetic engineering such as evolving virulent strains of bacteria and viruses for biological warfare could prove detrimental to human survival and it could also destroy the genetic wealth of plants and animals on earth. Dr. Jain stated during the 15th International Congress of Genetics Scientific Programme that the tremendous potential of genetic engineering for making new drugs and raising crop production should not be misused. He expressed concern that with the development of high-yield rice and wheat varieties, traditional crop varieties which man has been evolving for the past 10,000 years, were bound to get lost. Some 15 years ago there were 30,000 rice varieties in use in the country, but now it is only 15 and the number will dwindle to about five or six in the next five years, he opined.

For the first time human gene responsible for raising blood pressure has been identified by Australian scientists. They claim, in doing so, they have made a major contribution to the search for a treatment for high blood pressure that is 'free from side effects'. The research has been carried out at the Australian National University and the University of Sydney. Dr. John Shine, leader of the team of scientists, says it involved discovery of the gene that produces *renin*, an enzyme secreted by the kidneys which triggers off a

Rarest Archive

chain of reactions to raise blood pressure. The researchers say they will not be able to use recombinant DNA techniques to make colonies of bacteria that will produce human *renin* for "harvest" For the first time scientists will be able to run adequate experiments on how to inhibit the action of *renin*, which until now has been available only in minute quantities extracted from human kidneys, which contain concentrations of *renin*, just one part per million. Knowledge of the structure of the *renin* gene may enable the researchers to design an agent that acts on the gene's regulator "switch" and turns off *renin* production. Dr. Brian Morris of Sydney University, said a treatment for high blood pressure that inhibits *renin* had "a good chance" of being free from side effects, a problem current treatments suffer from. An India-born scientist working in Canada, Dr. Sarang Narang, has created an artificial gene that can produce human *Proinsulin* from yeast cells. *Proinsulin* is a precursor of *insulin*. which is used by 60 million diabetics in the world. At present, this vital hormone is extracted from pancreas of slaughtered pigs and cattle. There is not enough *insulin* to go round and it has the drawback of being of animal origin. But now the totally synthetic gene which codes for human *Proinsulin* has been produced by Dr. Narang, opening the way for microbial production of human *insulin*.

Boston University researchers say they have found a crude form of a substance that causes blood vessels to generate in laboratory animals, a finding that may be useful in treating heart disease, stroke and cancer. The unidentified substance comes from

Rarest Archiver

omentum, a membrane that encases organs in the abdomen. Blood substitute fluids capable of performing the crucial oxygen-carbon dioxide transfer in the body are currently being tested and could be on the US market within a few years. Two sources for the substitutes are fluorocarbon emulsion — synthetic drugs not derived from blood or blood components — and haemoglobin solutions, which are natural. One fluorocarbon emulsion product called *fluosol* has already been tested in large numbers in Japan, and it is being studied in the treatment of heart disease and stroke.

It would be any farmer's dream to have food crops that can grow in salty soil, resist insects without pesticides and get their own nutrients for growth. And what if he could also have a cow as big as an elephant and capable of yielding 45,000 pounds of milk a year? These are no figments of imagination. Latest strides in biotechnology and the gene revolution, the second greatest turning point in world farming after the green revolution, have put the impossible within reach. Scientists say that they have currently the ability to grow wheat sustained by salt water, corn that can survive a drought and tomatoes that are square in shape to make their transport and processing more efficient. Genetic alternations to allow higher yields and resistance to disease and weather will be in widespread use by the year 2,000, according to "The New Plant Genetics" — a three-year study released in New York recently, which examines how genetic engineering can aid the world's 28 most important food crops. However, more than

Rarest Archive

the technological problems the economical problems are causing a serious hindrance for the development of this type of genetic manipulation , as contributions from food and seed production corporations have severely cut down their budgets. The study forecasts about 15 to 20 per cent over—all increase in food production.

Some scientists have succeeded in producing organisms which "eat" oil so as to be able to clean oil spills, and in producing enzyme - producing bacteria which literally consume metals like magnesium, manganese, iron, cobalt etc. and they can help in mining of these metals in their pure form. The credit for engineering a bacterium which could clean up crude oil goes to Dr. Ananda Chakravarthy, a young biochemist from Calcutta, who has been doing research in the Medical Centre of the University of Illinois in Chicago. By chemically manipulating the genes, he collected into one cell a lot of different plasmids, building diverse capacities into one single cell. The new bacterium that was evolved could simultaneously reduce several components of crude oil into protein and carbon di-oxide and could clean up crude oil eight times quicker than the usual process. Dr. Chakravarthy's application for a patent right for this process has been granted by the United States Supreme Court.

Harvard Medical School scientists claimed that they had discovered where the deadly AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) virus

Rarest Archive

reproduces in the human cell and called the find an important step towards an eventual cure. The reproductive process of the virus, which can replicate its own molecules 1,000-fold within each cell, takes place in a different portion of the cell's genetic meterial from that of any other known virus, the researchers stated. Dr. William Haseltine and his team of researchers said AIDS virus reproduction starts in a part of the cell known as RNA (ribonucleic acid) rather than in the DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) which is the substance thought to regulate genes. Dr. Robert Gallo, of the National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, U. S., who is one of the co-discoverer of the AIDS virus, said recently in Bangalore that viral diversity was a worry when it came to vaccine development. He stated that more than half the types of cancer in the world are caused by viruses. AIDS was caused by one virus, but the manifestations were many. He opined that the AIDS virus did not originate in the U. S., but must have found its way from the green monkeys of Africa.

Vitamin 'A' and carotene in eggs together help cut down a substantial percentage of cancerous cells in the human body, according to a Canadian medical report. Carotene is described as an orange or red substance which acts as a source of Vitamin 'A'. The report published in the issue of "The Poultry Times" in Bombay, said experiments conducted in the Philippines by Canadian Research Centre's (CRC) Dr. Hans Stitch covered a group of 36 men and women. Nobel Laureate Har Govind Khorana held out the promise of a bacterial clue to the mechanisms of the human

Rarest Archive

eye at the recent 15th International Congress of Genetics in New Delhi in December, 1985. In the most popular session of the Congress, the pioneer Indian-born geneticist spoke of a recent startling discovery by him of a protein in the *haelo* bacteria which is driven by Vitamin 'A' — the same force that controls the optical mechanisms of the human eye. In the field of clinical genetics one significant advance had been the application of the post-natal examination of foetal cells which can help detect serious genetic disorders far in advance of the birth of the child. Early detection of such a disorder, as early as the fifth week of pregnancy, can help one decide on whether to terminate the pregnancy at a stage when it may be safer and psychologically less depressing, said Dr. D. S. Borgoankar of the Wilmington Medical Centre, Delaware, U.S. The 15th International Congress on Genetics was told by scientists that they have achieved a significant breakthrough in developing monoclonal antibodies which could be used in evolving anti-cancer antibodies. The newly developed antibodies identify proteins which initiate division of cells during the cell division period, according to Dr. Potu N. Rao, India-born scientist now settled in the United States.

Scientists have extracted human genetic material from a year - old Egyptian boy mummified around 400 BC and have grown it in tissue culture in a laboratory, the British scientific journal, "Nature", reported recently. Mr. Peter Newmark, the weekly's Deputy Editor, said it is the first time scientists have been able to extract specimens of DNA from an ancient human or earlier primitive man and reproduce the

Rarest Archiver

genetic material in a controlled environment. Mr. Newmark said the idea of restoring on extinct animal species by cloning remained far-fetched. He told the Associated Press that the modern genetic engineering methods of cloning to reproduce DNA from specimens thousands of years old could have a profound impact on the study of evolution. The rapid advances in medical science and surgery justifiably evoke the comment: 'What are things coming up?' A dramatic progress has been made in the last few months in successful liver transplants. The surgical frontier is being extended to the brain, giving new hope to the paralysed and others suffering from disease traceable to brain malfunctions. These accomplishments of brain tissue implants have largely gone unnoticed. However, they hold immense potentially for improving conditions hitherto treated as incurable. Recent researchs indicate that science stands on the threshold of promising new discoveries in this virtually virgin field. So far, patients suffering from Parkinson's Disease, due to degeneration of a section of their brain which supplies dopamine, received erratic and only temporary help from a drug. Scientists now reason that if feotal brain tissue could be implanted into a patient's brain at the right spot, perhaps, effective levels of dopamine could be produced. American scientists have remained relatively hesitant on the subject. Swedish neurosurgeons have attempted just such a procedure. They have transplanted tissue from a patient's own adrenal glands. One Parkinson's Disease patient experienced initial improvement and a lessened need for drugs. A second patient, a 45-year-old woman, is reportedly doing well. The results are thought to be encouraging.

Rarest Archive

Researchers need to locate the most effective site implantation. Results depend upon right placements. One researcher fears that a human brain may need many grafts to produce enough dopamine to ease a patient's tremors and rigidity. The procedure could perhaps be used also to cure Alzhemier's Disease, in which brain cells die. What we are seeing today is only the beginning of an idea which scientists are attempting to follow up to cure brain-connected diseases. Doctors are approaching the subject with 'fundamental optimism' and do not predict as to when crucial research will yield reliable cures. As brain implant research presses ahead, researchers face one major complication. Their only source of experimental materials is human embryos whose availability is restricted. In 1974 Congress ordered a moratorium on all research involving the human foetus, but one year later, the prohibition was lifted. A recent conference of neurosurgeons has summed up the position neatly. It says : "The moment the scientists decide the time is right, we can expect that a deluge of people suffering from irreparable loss of function, will demand treatment." The conference thinks that future research will depend on decisions on public policy issues. Doctors say that for brain implantations there is no substitute for foetal tissue. The young embryonic tissue is less likely to be rejected by the host. Young nerve cells have a plasticity that permits them to become integrated into their new environment. They grow rapidly and can form connections more easily. But the use of foetuses poses serious legal and ethical problems Women might be encouraged to grow such material for transplantation purposes. Pregnant women may be pressured or bribed to abort. Such malpractices will be "dehumanising",

Rarest Archive

some philosophers and religious people feel. As against this the argument that a foetus can be considered as "an anatomical gift" is equally impressive. Parents can donate a foetus as they would a kidney. If a foetus is considered a cadaver, the parents could have the option of donation. While some people have advanced "high moral values" to debar use of a foetus to provide relief to a living person, others are unmoved by concerns for the dead in order to better serve the living.

Laser (acronym for Light Amplified by Stimu'ated Emission of Radiation), which has over the years become a major scientific phenomenon since its invention in 1957, is today replacing several conventional methods in industrial, technological and medical applications. One of the countries which has carried out advanced research in this field and introduced new uses of laser is the Soviet Union. The country's scientists and technicians have developed a number of laser-based gadgets, which have applications apart from other fields, in micro-surgery and bloodless surgery, which includes complicated heart operations A Soviet machinery and equipment exhibition held recently in Bombay had on display an array of the latest and sophisticated laser gadgets now used in the Soviet Union in several fields of science, technology, industry and medicine. One such important gadget, developed by the Lebedev Physical Institute under the Academy of Sciences, is a laser installation which can carry out operations on ischaemic patients. Two operations were performed in 1985, it is learnt. By using the laser equipment, the life-saving channels

Rarest Archive

in the myocardium (one of the patients operated upon had some 40 of them made using the traditional process) are drifted by pulsed beams produced by the laser. It took the powerful beam only 500 microseconds to make a channel in the cardiac tissue, fusing it instantly. Very soon the artificial channels were overgrown with a layer of endothelium cells, lining the inner walls of blood vessels, and these started functioning as reliable auxiliary arteries. Another important factor noticed after the operation was the brief period required for the patient to recover. The day after the operation, the two patients could sit up in their beds and in a few more days they were discharged from the hospital and placed under the observation of rehabilitation specialists.

Another field of application of laser is in optical quantum generators. Surgeons now have an extremely sharp, minute and sterile instrument possessing some entirely new characteristics. The laser beam scalpel makes it possible to perform bloodless operations, rendering blood transfusions, suturing, bandaging and even using painkillers obsolete. It also speeds up recovery of the patients. Ophthalmological laser beams developed in the Soviet Union have been patented in 13 countries, including the US, Canada, Britain and France. A laser beam provides a unique opportunity to perform a very subtle operation without cutting the eyeball or coming into direct contact with the affected tissue. Soviet doctors use laser beams to remove cataracts and treat glaucoma and other eye disorders. Organs in the body like liver, pancreas and spleen can also be subjected to laser surgery.

Rarest Archiver

These organs react to conventional surgery in a specific way. Firstly, the minutest incision results in profuse bleeding ; secondly, the traumatised pancreas starts releasing an acid agent that burns anything around; thirdly, conventional ways of blocking blood vessels and suturing tissues are of no use. Use of laser beam in such operations by surgeons in US, Japan and some other countries had failed, but in the Soviet Union this problem was solved by the specialists of All - Union Research Centre for Laser Application in Surgery. They devised the following technique: First, the narrow strip of the organ to be operated on was dried up by special forceps and then cut by a laser beam. They have also designed special suturing devices based on dosed compression. The computer - laser unit developed at the Institute of Botany under the Ukrainian Academy of Science and installed inside an aircraft can determine the state of agricultural crops on any area, as well as make recommendations for crop care and forecast yield. Laser computers and fibre optics communication systems capable of transmitting hundreds of thousands of telephone conversations and any number of TV programmes at a time are no longer science fiction. Soviet scientists have also designed a TV screen of total area of 12 square metres. The image is projected on it by a laser tube with three light "guns" very small in diameter.

Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose, the Indian scientific wizard, was a fine example of the 'fertile union between the immemorial mystycism of Indian philosophy and the experimental methods of Western

Rarest Archive

science.' In 1902 Bose published a monograph on "Responses in the Living and the Non-living", which was to create a revolution in scientific thinking and a tremendous excitement in the non-scientific world owing to the pantheistic nature of its scientific conclusions. In fact, Bernard Shaw, as a vegetarian, was rather unhappy to find that a piece of cabbage was thrown into a state of violent convulsion when scalded to death. Considering electric response to stimulation as the criterion of 'livingness', Sir J. C. Bose tried to show that under similar conditions, electric responses could be obtained from both living and non-living specimens by stimulating. In a sense, he became the biographer of plants. Very much attracted by deep investigation of the properties of electric waves, he began to investigate the physiological properties of plant tissues and to show the similarity of their behaviour to that of animal tissues. He conducted some experiments with an apparatus which he called 'coherer' or 'the electric eye' and in due course he turned a biophysicist. He 'demolished' the demarcation line between physiological processes and physical phenomena. The physiological process was but an expression of the physio-chemical process flowing from those responsive processes in life already foreshadowed in non-life, constituting a pattern of continuity without any break in the chain linking up the living and the non-living. Sir J. C. Bose perfected his instruments and in 1911 completed the Resonant Recorder, which could estimate time values as short as one thousandth of a second. To measure linear growth movements in plants he constructed in 1917 his compound Lever Crescograph, which would show a magnification of 5,000 times. Then

Rarest Archive

came the Magnetic Crescograph, which magnified one million times; the "Bubbler" or Photosynthetic Recorder in 1922 for measuring the rate of photosynthesis of plants. And the Diametric Contraction Apparatus in 1927 to show diametric expansion and contraction in plants under the effects of heat and cold, poisons and stimulants. He became legendary figure in science circles and was profusely a honoured by science bodies and the British Government.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CONSCIOUSNESS

Psychology and the latest psychiatry can, generally speaking, be taken as the scientific extensions of the psycho—social phase of science. No wonder then in psychology the scientists have acknowledged the principle of the very intricate and mutual inter-relation between "psyche" (the mind) and "soma" (the body) and much of their therapeutic methods and medicines are devised on this fundamental principle. The first mental health revolution unshackled the insane, and by calling them 'sick' it managed to treat them as human. Its monuments and symbols are the extensive and huge, but isolated, state mental hospitals. The second mental revolution came from the spread of dynamic psychiatry (mainly Freud's) and was characterised by individual, one-to-one psychotherapy. Now, the third revolution throws off the constraints of the doctor-patient medical model — the idea that mental disorder is private misery — and relates the trouble and the cure — to the entire web of social and personal relationships in which the individual is caught.

Rarest Archive

In Indian society particularly with its strong tradition of familial control over matters economic, social, cultural, psychological and even spiritual, families are a crucial microcosm and have a pronounced effect on the individual's outlook on life, nay on his aspirations and behaviour. Forming the most basic of larger networks of kinship, caste and community, they enjoy a primacy that cannot be exaggerated, and it can be said with a degree of certainty that the family has, with regard to an individual's mental health development, the capacity to create, to enrich, to conserve or preserve but at the same time to damage and destroy effective personality growth. For this reason, mainly, psychiatry sees the role of the family in the complex matrix of inter-personal dynamics as a vital link in the cure, rehabilitation and tolerance of the mentally ill. Naturally, the family is seen by psychiatrists as a two-edged sword, positive or negative as the case may be, its influence depending on the kind of role-relationships sustained within it, the particular climate of acceptance and tolerance it creates, the value system it adopts, and more importantly, the supports or stresses it offers its members in crisis situations.

The two-day seminar organized by the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, in 1984 was an important event in which physicists, biologists, biochemists, biophysicists and experts in other related disciplines from all over the world were engaged in trying to solve a mystery which still eludes science — viz. the relation of the brain as a physical entity to intelligence, consciousness, creativity and the various

Rarest Archive

areas of experience where the human mind seems to be more powerful than matter. Granted that the mind is entirely based on physical brain function, it is still very far from clear that physical descriptions of brain structure and function can explain the complexities of the human mind. The brain of a mathematician looks just like the brain of a painter or even a moron. Scientists have not yet been able to unravel the crucial physical features which give individualities of mind. If human brain works by representing—science tells us that perceptions are representations—then we need to know the code, i. e. the rules of representation, which modern physics or rather departments of science have yet to formulate. Although the technological revolution has created computers and robots which can even think and mimic certain other functions of the brain, in a large number of situations, the mind seems to have definite power and control over matter. Apart from the area of intellectual creativity, there are areas of experience involving the phenomena of hypnosis, extrasensory perception, telepathy, telekinesis, which often shade off into the occult regions of witchcraft, magic and astrology and hoaxes by charlatans and godmen. They are difficult to explain in a scientific fashion. They are also hard to analyse scientifically, due to the fact that they are not easily reproducible in laboratory conditions. Yet, because they involve, in one way or another, many human beings and still defy scientific explanations, they give strong popular support for the existence of mind in its own right as an entity divorced from, or undetermined by, the physical constituents of the human body.

Rarest Archive

Professor B. D. Josephson, a Nobel Laureate who is with the Physics Department of Cambridge University, attended the New Delhi conference and in an interview with Mr. Sumanta Bannerjee, of "Deccan Herald", posed the dilemma of modern science in explaining human mind behaviour when he said: "The present focus of science has been on the materialistic aspects of nature, and this has been so successful that many scientists declare the spiritual aspect to be non-existent. This state of affairs is a reflection of the fact that science has only developed to a certain limited degree. As it advances and experiments and theories develop, the spiritual side will start to become important in observations and theories." Elaborating on this point, he said: "If one were to study living existence, one would find that the detailed organization could not be accounted for in terms of current scientific principles. There are problems in connection with certain areas like creativity, process of insight, etc. which modern biology cannot explain." It seems current principles of science are inadequate for a proper description of nature at the micro level, a limitation termed by Prof. Josephson as "the descriptive inadequacy of modern science." This limitation is more acute in the description of the biological system. Even quantum machanics, which at one time was expected to explain this, cannot actually describe what is going on at a quantum level, especially in complicated systems. It is because of this limitation and crisis of modern science that attempts are being made by some scientists to establish some connection between modern science and the spiritual scriptures of the past.

Rarest Archive

Taking part in the discussion on "Biophysical Basis of the Mind", Dr. R. K. Mishra, Head of the Department of Biophysics at the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi, stated : "The most important difficulty in having a thorough-going analysis of the matter is the question of consciousness which cannot be explained. He said that in the Vedas and *Nyaaya-Vaisheshika* philosophies consciousness is considered as an atomic phenomenon and averred: "There is an atom of Chetana in *Nyaaya-Vaisheshika* also. Therefore, the fundamental facet of nature is consciousness; it is coextensive with nature Dr. Mishra then dealt with the self-organizing system of nature, which gets more and more organized — a system for which the distinguished mathematician John von Neumann gave the term "finite automate". Dr. Mishra further stated : "We propose that if we have a loose structure in the scheme of things, finite automate made of loose structure will have mind-like properties. They will be able to select something, reject something, identify and therefore form or trace, a behaviour pattern and this can go on organizing itself. It is a complex system, with everything affecting everything."

What then is the relation between mind and brain? Are they different but causally linked (like parts of a mechanism) or are they causally independent yet somehow synchronized? Is consciousness a result of interactions at the quantal atomic level, where the macroscopic laws of classical physics do not apply, according to the scientists? But is consciousness generated by brain function? While scientists are still

Rarest Archive

groping for theoretical answers to these questions, interesting experiments are being carried out in universities in the West, which tend to postulate the existence of the mind as an active thing, existing in some way in its own right. Prof. Froehlich, a Fellow of the Royal Society, is working in Chadwick Laboratory in England with neurons. The human brain (apart from the cerebellum, which does not seem to be involved in cognitive functions) contains about ten billion "switching elements" called neurons. Most neurobiologists believe that the neurons are the active elements in brain function. Prof. Josephson informed the conference of the experiments being done in the Stanford Research Institute on mind and matter. Even ordinary people can be trained to view distant locations or in psychokinesis, which involves using instrumentations to pick up small deformations of matter. Small deformations can be made by persons without the interference of external instruments, by bending, with their hands' over the tool. Not every one can do such things, but some people have this natural skill. Experiments with noise interacting with matter or picking up information from a distance, or spanning time are made while excluding electrical or acoustic disturbances. Similar experiments are being carried out at the Mind Science Foundation Laboratory at San Antonio.

An interesting aspect of such experiments is the role of children. According to Prof. Josephson, in matters like extra-sensory perception (ESP), experiments suggest that children start off being good at it and then it declines, specially at the age when they start abstract thinking." The explanation could be that

Rarest Archive

children may be born with such abilities, or it may be a question of not allowing abstract thinking. Prof. Josephson feels that the analytical part of the mind seems to interfere with psychic functioning. Referring to this problem of inadequacy of theory to explain "the sixth sense" that the brain displays, he said that if that faculty of the brain exists it must also possess energy, as psychokinesis shows. "Then how can these various paranormal experiences be taken as evidence of a new field of force generated by this new faculty?" — he asked. Prof. Josephson felt that: "The situation could change if we could have a good theory which could work on presupposing a connection between quantum theory and the mind, and may be able to describe mathematically such phenomena."

An interesting fall out of the experiments is the rediscovery of the truths enunciated in the Indian scriptures. If they are stripped of their religious or ritualistic interpretations, they may be found to have voiced concepts towards which modern scientists are hesitatingly moving forward today. The stress in Indian philosophy on Reality as One — that means, where the apparent differences of 'subject' and 'object' have merged or vanished — probably anticipated in some respects the stress on uncertainties as in Quantum Mechanics, which tells us that the observer (the subject) can never be essentially separate from what he observes (the object); that observations upset the micro-events providing information; that there is an essential interaction between the observation and what is observed on the microscopic scale, and therefore we can "only observe probabilities" (to quote

Rarest Archive

Sir Arthur Eddington, who — to explain the resolution limits that are imposed by the discreteness of energy transfer — compared our search with that of the fisherman who never discovers fish smaller than the holes of his net), since the very act of observing affects what is observed. Although philosophical contents and interpretations of the ritualistic and meditative aspects of spiritual scriptures were later on "mystified", the ancient scriptures perhaps originally might have expressed the basic problem of relations between mind and matter. Since modern scientific terms like 'particles', 'light — speed', 'light years' etc were not available, they perhaps talked in a vocabulary that was relevant to the contemporary society — the language of symbols, myths etc. Western scientists today, unable to find theoretical explanations for various phenomena in modern science, are perhaps harking back to the old Indian scriptures on finding several parallels in the approach of our seers and sages towards this world and human beings and their supreme goal of life when taken in its totality of experiences. The scientists are of late trying to decode the concepts and methodology that are implicit in them and interpret them afresh into a language of science and mathematics which is 'more meaningful' to us living in this nuclear age.

The bootstrap hypothesis of Geoffrey Chew, mentioned earlier, not only denies the existence of fundamental constituents of matter, but accepts no fundamental entities whatsoever — no fundamental laws, equations or principles — and thus abandons

Rarest Archive

another idea which has been an essential part of natural science for centuries. The notion of fundamental laws of nature was derived from the belief in a divine lawgiver which was deeply rooted in the Judaeo-Christian tradition and religions. In the words of Thomas Aquinas: "There is a certain Eternal Law, to wit. Reason, existing in the mind of God and governing the whole universe." The notion of an eternal, divine law of nature greatly influenced Western philosophy and science. Descartes wrote about the 'laws which God has put into nature'; Newton believed that the highest aim of his scientific work was to give evidence of the 'laws impressed upon nature by God.' To discover the ultimate fundamental laws of nature remained the aim of natural sciences for the three centuries after Newton. In modern physics a very different attitude has now developed. Physicists have come to see that all their theories of natural phenomena, including the 'laws' they describe, are creations of the human mind; properties of our conceptual map of Reality, rather than of Reality itself. What makes science so successful is the discovery that approximations are possible, and if one is satisfied with an approximate 'understanding or viewpoint' of nature, that cannot be designated as the Reality or Truth in its finality.

Julian Huxley stated in his book, "Religion without Revelation", that — "Science has gone a long way towards proving the essential unity of all phenomena -- There seems to be no escape from the belief that all reality has both a material and a mental side." J. B. S. Haldane, eminent biologist

Rarest Archive

states in one of his lectures on "Unity and Diversity": "I think that only two of the discoveries of this century in physics are of profound philosophical importance. One is Einstein's discovery that time and space are aspects of the same kind of relationship. The other is that the distinction between the particles of the same kind is not absolute — It helps me to believe that the distinction between you and me, or the nearest mosquito and me is nothing absolute either." Charles Sherrington, a Noble Laureate and one of the greatest Neurophysiologists was of the opinion that mind or spirit should not be explained away in terms of matter. In his book, "Man and Nature", he writes: "Biology cannot go far in its subjects without being met by mind. Though living is analisable and describable by natural sciences, that associate of living, i. e. thought, escapes and remains refractory to natural science, repudiates it as something outside its ken." Einstein himself, the modern science Colossus, has made many statements smacking of his Jewish religious influence, and he had said that beyond the phenomenon, what the thinkers and mystics call as "noumenon" may be what the religionists call God.

Sir George Porter, Fullerian Professor of Chemistry and Director of the Royal Institution, UK, made his mark as an originator of methods especially a technique called "flash photolysis" to initiate and record extremely fast chemical reactions. Every chemical reaction takes some time before it is complete. The time taken varies from reaction to

Rarest Archive

reaction. Some reactions are fast enough to be almost spontaneous, and the reaction times in such cases are measured in nanoseconds (one nanosecond is one-billionth of a second) and today reaction times of the order of a new hundred femtoseconds (one thousandth of a nanosecond is one femtosecond) can be studied, thanks to techniques developed mainly by Porter, Roland Norrish and others. The knowledge gained from the development of experimental techniques for studying fast reactions (for which Porter shared the Nobel Prize in chemistry with Norrish and the German chemist Manfred Eigen in 1967) has been utilized by Porter's group at the Royal Institution to study photosynthesis and also create artificial photosynthetic systems. In his opinion, science was becoming a new religion, but a religion based on acquisition of more and more knowledge and one which could provide conclusive and immutable answers to questions about first causes, purpose of life etc. Science, he says, is "an approach to a new code of ethics, to an understanding of ourselves and an understanding of the purpose of life." In some sense, Sir George says, science has destroyed religion. The great religions could answer questions like — "What we are? Where we are? and Why we are?" with a deliberate finality. But science cannot do it. In his opinion, if one accepted the premise that science was the new religion (albeit secular), then one is led to the conclusion that the only purpose of life is to discover the purpose of life. This is not sophistry, but is a major problem of our times. With science displacing religion as an appreach to truth, the religious dogmas of yesteryear no longer suffice as rudders in the journey of life. In a very real sense,

Rarest Archive

human beings today are deprived — have been deprived — of the religious certitudes without science having erected any new certitudes in their stead. If we can somehow reconcile ourselves to this loss of certitude we would then be in a position . . . to develop new truths (or approximations to them) based on the surer empirical knowledge provided by science. As for applied science, it is quite possible to pervert the knowledge gained from research, he says. He is one with many leading scientists of the world who would (and do) separate the categories of development and use. Sir George averred : "Social responsibility of a scientist might well be a form of social irresponsibility."

VEDANTA AND REALITY

If all the three phases of evolution in this universe as depicted and revealed by Astrophysics, Nuclear Physics and Biology in the macrocosmic, the microcosmic and the psycho-social aspects, respectively, are taken together and examined dispassionately with a comprehensive and Intuitive viewpoint right from the single hydrogen atom to the complex living unit of homo sapien, then the subtle truth of all creation flashes before our mind, and that is : At each and every stage in this complex phenomenon of fusion and transformation, the process of evolution advances into larger wholes through fusion and integration of matter. Especially in the biological phase, at each stage more and more consciousness or awareness is manifest in the units, reaching its consummation in the self-conscious, highly intelligent human being, whom the philosophers

Rarest Archive

describe as an image or a replica of the Ultimate Reality Itself. This pronounced orderliness seems apparently to contradict the second law of Thermodynamics, viz. with the passage of time, entropy or disorder and disintegration must increase. However, no biologist in his true wisdom can reject the overwhelming evidence against disorder and disintegration as evident in the evolution of inert matter into a living organism. Being the final product of this complex evolutionary process, this 'integrating and unifying force' is most distinctly and predominantly manifest in man, who shows an immense capacity to act intelligently with insight and foresight and through his natural faculties who can intuitively visualize the highly systematized empirical sciences as also intuitively experience here and now the transcendental super-sensory philosophical truth as enunciated by the scriptural texts, the authoritative sources for the philosophical science of the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*.

Evolution reveals a scale of forms and structures of greater orderliness, complexity and coherence. The highest of such forms thrown up by cosmic evolution is the human being, who is the culmination of this tendency to integrate and unify diverse elements into a harmonious whole. The story of cosmic evolution, as science tells us today, is the story of the phased transformation of matter 'from the bare protons to the paragon of all animals, i. e. man'. So, to gain an insight into this mysterious force operative, creating order, integration and unity in the cosmos, the proper study for mankind must be the analysis of this multi-dimensional man himself as a self-conscious

Rarest Archive

being, and this is the basic theme of Advaita Vedanta, the Indian philosophical science as propounded in its authoritative scriptural sources called the *Upanishads.*

Dr. Raja Ramanna, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission of India and one of the leading international physicists, says in his two articles — "Advaita is related to science" and "Super Symmetry" in Hindu, July 1984: "Advaita was not just an esoteric puzzle, which few could understand, to be dabbled in by elderly people, but a presentation of the logical consequences of all thinking closely related to science. My brain was triggered into a condition to understand, at least partially if not fully, Advaita not as a confusing recondite philosophical tract, but as one of the most fantastic logical attempts to understand all knowledge with reference to what is truth and reality. — The Advaita of Shankara is inevitably the one and only attempt to define truth and reality comprehending all knowledge derived, as it were, out of pure logic with all its implications .... In such a strictly defined department as mathematics unresolvable paradoxes are unavoidable. It is only to be expected that in a wider field of knowledge when the role of human consciousness plays a greater part and words do not have a one-to-one meaning but a one-to-many mapping, the possibilities of confused thinking and reasoning is great and this is what Shankara warns us of, all the time .... Indian logic with reference to inference (*Anumaana*) has its own form of syllogism, and starts with a major statement which is some sort of a generalisation (*Vyaapti*) from which by reasoning (*Hetu*) we arrive at something particular.

Rarest Archive

This inference may be different for oneself (*Swaartha*) and for others (*Paraartha*). All leading schools of Indian philosophy assume that generalisation is the groundwork of inference — an assumption of great importance in understanding Advaita. It is only the materialistic schools of the *Chaarvaakas* who object to this and claim that from generalisation nothing can be obtained which is new.

"It is clear that as science progresses, more facts observed on the structure of the universe will be explained in a unified way. In other words, a few laws and generalisations should be sufficient to explain all aspects of nature that we can observe in the physical sense. This has been constantly happening in science. The work of Galileo and Newton unified all astronomy and mechanics, the electro–magnetic theory unified electricity, magnetism and light and more recently it seems that just thrce laws are required to explain everything in nature and efforts are in progress to unify even these three laws as well. In the process of unification, the laws of nature are now expressed as symmetries of various types, be it the geometric symmetry of the crystal or symmetry of interactions or symmetry in quantum behaviour. It is ultimately the symmetry of the process that becomes the law of physics. Obviously if there is to be a total unification of physical laws, it has to lead up to some very highly complex degree of symmetry. If further we are made up of atoms and molecules, these symmetries must be such as to include even human consciousness. It will mean a hyper-super symmetry of some sort. Sometimes the

Rarest Archive

physical laws appear not as pure symmetries of a process but as a result of a break in the symmetry. Much of fundamental physics is based on broken symmetries. We shall see this is of some relevance to Shankara's Advaita, in the sense that if the supreme Brahman can be considered as the supreme symmetry, the break from this symmetry (*Maaya*) is the cause of the real world. While essentially we are made of atoms, due to the complexity of the combinations, something like consciousness appears nearly in all living beings. It is so highly developed in man that he can ask questions about himself and even control nature. If, however, all this has to remain within the regime of physics, only a supreme symmetry and / or a departure from it can explain the real world. It is a well-known fact that physically entities which are identical from the molecular and atomic point of view exhibit different phases of existence and transformations from one phase to the other. An example of this is 'water' which appears as ice (solid), water (liquid) and steam (gas). The physical laws which hold good for one do not necessarily hold good for the other. I stress on the importance of the existence of different phases in physical structure because, as we see in discussing Advaita, consciousness can also appear in different phases in the brain, each having its own region of validity.

"I have referred to the fact that we are all made of atoms and molecules and we must also take note of the fact that the sub-structure of atoms and molecules is so complicated that one has to give up the idea of a particle as such and think in terms

Rarest Archive

of interactions and fields as more important entities. This appearance in physics of quantities like wave function, quarks etc. which are not even observable directly by us are closer to many abstract philosophical ideas which hitherto had no support from science. Now science itself is forcing these ideas on philosophy. . . . Shankara says that all knowledge can be comprehended if we assume that consciousness has three phases of existence: 1. The waking condition (*Jaagrat* or objective experience), 2. the dream state (*Swapna*, which includes impressions or *Vaasanas* of the waking), 3. the dreamless state (*Sushupti*, where objective experience does not exist). The first of these refers to the stage in which all observations are made through our senses like the eyes, ears, nose, touch etc. and all of science is based on this phase. We also cannot ignore the fact that some sort of a consciousness is operating even when one is asleep. The thoughts in a dream may be just residues of what has happened during the day; or they may be illusions as a result of mal-operation of the bodily systems, but we must take note of the fact that several mathematicians, physicists and artists have received inspiration during this phase. Bertrand Russel has said when writing his famous work—"Principia Mathematica"— that while at the end of the day he was unable to prove any of the conjectured theorems, in the morning within a few minutes of starting he had the answers to all of them. The brain must have been active all the night while he was asleep. Many poets have been inspired in the same manner. Modern psychologists may not accept the dream state as another phase in human consciousness, but the fact

Rarest Archive

remains that the brain is active while the rest of the body is in a transformed phase.

"Says Shankara in *Vivekachudaamani* (V. C.) : 'Just as in *Swapna* (dream) the universe existing in one's own self is seen as if it were external, so, be it known that even in the *Jaagrat* (waking) state this universe exists within and appears to be external' — 'In dream things appear by the light of one's own self. There is, then, indeed no other light. The wise have concluded that the case is just the same even in *Jaagrat*'....'Both waking and dreaming are subject to the illusion that intellect imposes on us. In this respect there is no difference between them.' The third and last phase is more difficult to follow ... In Indian philosophy this phase is called *Sushupti*', a dreamless sleep — where consciousness is totally separated from the body. Here there are no ideas or contradictions and objects in the waking and other states do not bind it. What is important to note is that each state has its only validity and relevance for that particular state. That Shankara was not being merely mystical in this thinking is clear from the sloka in V. C. ; 'The universe does not exist apart from the sense perceptions and the perceptions of its separateness is false like the quality of blueness of the sky. Has a superimposed attribute any meaning apart from its substratum ? It is the substratum which appears like that through delusion.'

"We attempt to summarise the standpoint of Shankara as to what is absolute truth and

Rarest Archive

reality. We differentiate between absolute truth and relative truth, in that the latter refers to that which we observed in waking and dream states of consciousness and is of an ephemeral nature. Purely for the sake of general argument, let us admit that our states of consciousness have different states of existence, not necessarily as enumerated by Shankara under the name of *Avasthaatraya*, but enough to accept the waking state and *Samaadhi* as the two limiting states of consciousness. In between there may be many others. If we define truth as something that cannot be contradicted and remains invariant in space and time etc. the laws of physics can claim to be absolute truth as long as we perceive it in the waking state of consciousness. But what of the other states, where time and relative measure of things are different. For example, in the dream state the mystical associations may dominate. In the final state of *Sushupti*, it is considered as the one in which no ideas exist and there is no thought of anything regarding which a contradiction or doubt may ever be conceived to exist. In these various states there must be something which is common to all of them in as far as truth is concerned. The nature of absolute truth is also such as not to admit of any contradiction or doubt and also be independent of time and space.

"When can we find a situation where there can be no contradiction and things remain invariant in space and time involving all knowledge? It can only be in the pure state of absolute supreme symmetry, i. e. the state of *Sushupti*. This, according to Shankara, can be the only absolute truth and reality and none

Rarest Archive

else is possible. This state can be called by several names, depending on the various states of enlightenment the person finds himself in. It can be God, absolute *Brahman*, super symmetric state and so forth—— In trying to find an intersection between the various states we have arrived at an all-embracing state difficult to define. Translating this into terms of the language of set theory, we started with a set of states of consciousness and looked for their intersection to get the truth component, but we have arrived at a stage where intersection and union has merged into one at some absolute infinite level."

CONCLUSION

Vedanta is truly a "science of all sciences, *par excellence*"— a super-science, for the simple reason that it is wholly based on Intuitive experience, which is the birthright of every human being as it is also naturally gifted to everyone by the Almighty. Our very existence, all our mental faculties and excellences as well as our physical activities and skills which we pursue — whether consciously or unconsciously — are supported and sustained by this magical wonder of Intuition. Vedanta, as a philosophical science, is supra-sensuous and supra-mental, and barring this god-given Intuition, nothing else can really help an aspirant or student to grasp or divine its genuine, pristine pure teachings or truths. In truth, knowing or cognizing the Ultimate Truth of the nature of one's own essential nature of Being with the help of this Intuition alone is the prime purpose or goal of all human existence and endeavour.

Rarest Archive

Having been steeped and trained in the traditional method of teaching as well as learning this Ultimate Reality, called in Vedantic parlance *Brahman* or *Atman*, based on this Intuition alone, Shankara delineated in his own inimitable style the immaculate and irrefutable methodology implicit in and through the *Upanishadic* lore in his extant *Bhashyas* or commentaries on the *Prasthaanatrayi*, viz. the ten principal *Upanishads*, *Bhagavad Geetha* and *Brahma Sutras*. Living up to the appellation of "Loka Shankara" — a world teacher and benefactor, Shankara adopted an extra-ordinary but exclusive method of "Intuitive reasoning", called *"Anubhavaanga Tarka* or *Shrauta Tarka"* in Vedanta, which is an all-consuming and all-comprehensive reasoning based on Intuition of life's totality of experiences, which are completely exhausted without any residue in everyone's three states of consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep.

As a result of the natural processes of decadence and degeneration in the calibre and culture of the aspirants and seekers of Truth, his unique fool-proof methodology was not properly and fully discerned by post-Shankara Vedantins, barring his direct disciple Sureshwaraachaarya, and this pristine pure methodology implicit in Shankara's original *Bhashyas* — and not the later commentaries — fell into oblivion. The present-day scholars and preceptors of Shankara's Vedanta, i. e. Advaita Vedanta, completely contrary to their visionary master's and teacher's teachings, have adopted a purely logical or dialectical method of approach in interpreting Śhankara's *Bhashyas* as also the *Upanishads* and have totally missed the mark. Akin to the

Rarest Archive

scientist's inferential theories, their interpretations are mainly based on *Anumaana* (inference) or *Tarka* (dialectics) with the result the Ultimate Reality they have 'deduced' lacks veracity and conviction. But, in this book, "The Magic Jewel of Intuition", the Intuitive reasoning based on the fundamental and traditional method of "*Adhyaaropa Apavaada*". or Superimposition and Rescission and its collateral principles of reasoning based on — (a) *Saarvatrika Poorna Anubhava* or universal and comprehensive tri-basic Intuition; (b) two important viewpoints in understanding subtle truths of nature, viz. *Vyaavahaarika Drishti* or empirical viewpoint and *Paaramaarthika Drishti* or absolute, transcendental Intuitive viewpoint — are utilized with a high skill and ingenuity by Shri Satchidaananda Saraswati Swamiji of Adhyaatma Prakaasha Kaaryaalaya, Holenarsipur, Hassan District, whose Kannada original called "*Paramaartha Chintaamani*" is the only source. In fact, this book is a free translation of that original book.

A true student of Vedanta should never commit the blunder of believing that Shankara's method is based on mere, pure dialectics. It was mainly for this misconception among the present-day scholars and commentators of Shankara's *Bhashyas* that his unique method was forgotten or overshadowed and eventually he was "dubbed" by many as a "great logician". True, he used an all-consuming logic or dialectical method of a very high order alright, but it is less appreciated and understood that his teachings about *Brahman* or *Atman*, the Ultimate Reality, were not based on mere logic alone but on the comprehensive

Rarest Archive

universal intuitive experience of Pure Consciousness ever present equally in every human being but is very subtle and latent, so to speak.

If Shankara's unique method is properly discerned and digested, the Vedantic teachings can be simplified in this following manner ; Man is completely engrossed in his mundane existence and its needs, which go by the name of "necessities of life". A human being, in general, is an extrovert and is more concerned with his relationship with, and dependence upon, the things and persons in the external world. To recapitulate what was stated earlier in the introductory remarks of this Appendix — he is more interested and involved in the "this" aspect of life, totally oblivious of the "I" aspect of life. If only he discriminates a little cautiously with all insight and patience, he can realize that without the "I" or the subject in him the "this" or the object cannot come into the reckoning. No one in the universe can "know" the existence of the external world without his being conscious of his "I"-hood or *Pramaatrutwa* (the cognizership). Although this *Pramaatrutwa* is coeval and coexistential with the objective "this", called *Prameya*, logical priority, to borrow Radhakrishnan's phrase, demands that without the "I" nobody can ever cognize the "this", and this fact is universally and eternally true. Following the traditional method of teaching, Shankara has called the innate identification with the body and conceiving or believing it to be identical with the "I" notion as *Adhyaasa* or misconception and *Avidya* or ignorance. Due to this natural (*Naisargika*) and hence causeless cause of subjective *Avidya*, man apprehends

Rarest Archive

the external world, the objective "this" with its multifarious names and forms — both animate and inanimate — called *Maaya*. Shankara never equates this subjective *Avidya* with the objective *Maaya* but has utilized these terms in vogue in the *Upanishadic* lore as a device to divert the attention of the seeker towards the really real Absolute Truth of *Saakshi Chaitanya* or Pure Consciousness, which is the substratum for both the "I" and the "this" aspects of life when taken as wholes. This *Saakshi Chaitanya* is real and both the "I" and the "this" are apparently real and hence the latter two aspects of life will be falsified (*Baadhita*) when the really real *Saakshi Chaitanya* is Intuited and established as the non-dual Reality. The method of *Avasthaatraya* or the three states of consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep, is a sure clincher in this expository system of Vedanta. This book, "The Magic Jewel of Intuition", hits the bull's eye, so to speak, in explaining and convincing the subtle truths of Vedanta as taught by Shankara and guides a true aspirant on his right path to attain the real purpose of life.

"OM TAT SAT"

Rarest Archives

Some of the important Kannada books of Swamiji

Translated to English by Sri D.B.Gangolli

Sl	*Book Name*	*Translation of*
1	The Magic Jewel of Intuition	**"Paramartha Chintamani"** : This magnum opus explains the subtle and secret teachings of Mandukya Upanishad using Avasthatraya Prakriye
2	The Essential Adi Shankara	**"Sankara Vedanta Sara"**: excellent reference book and a constant guide for a genuine student of Vedanta
3	Intuitive Approach to Sankara Vedanta	**"Vedantartha Sara Sangraha"**: Secrets of Adhyasa, Adhyaropa Apavada Nyaya revealed
4	The Basic Tenets of Sankara Vedanta	**"Sankara Vedantada Moolatatvagalu"**
5	The Pristine Pure Advaita Philosophy of Adi Sankara	**"Sankara Siddhanta"** : Explains pure Sankara Siddhanta and exposes the wrong interpretation of Vyakhyanakaras
6	The Philosophical Science of Vedanta	**"Adhyatma Vidye"**

For full particulars of price lists, please contact:

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org	
Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya Holenarsipura, Hassan District 473211 Ph : 08175 – 273820	Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya Bangalore Branch, 68, A.P.K Road, II Block Thyagarajanagar, Bangalore 560 028 Ph : 080 - 26765548